

the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges; without amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 875. An act for the relief of Mercy Duke Boehl; without amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1201. An act for the relief of Arthur F. Downs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 1563. An act for the relief of Ferris Rugles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1604. An act for the relief of Leo Stuhr; without amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of the Marine Engine Works and Shipbuilding Corp., of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of D. C. Todd; with amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of the S. G. Leoffler Operating Co., of Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of the Superior Coach Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2954. A bill for the relief of John Hamlet; with amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3744. A bill for the relief of Alfred E. Dudley and Eva L. Dudley; with amendments (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Jane O'Malley; with amendments (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4495. A bill for the relief of William H. Roman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Dolores Joyce; with amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ippolito; with amendments (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6010. A bill for the relief of the Yakutat Cooperative Market; without amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6011. A bill for the relief of Dr. Harry Burstein, Madeline Borvick, and Mrs. Clara Kaufman Truly (formerly Miss Clara M. Kaufman); without amendment (Rept. No. 2028).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6245. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Paul; without amendment (Rept. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6416. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to call a convention of the Indians of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 6417. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act. To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 352. Joint resolution creating a joint select committee to study and recommend legislation concerning labor relations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6418. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6419. A bill for the relief of Hatzel & Buehler, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6420. A bill for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6421. A bill for the relief of Walter U. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6422. A bill for the relief of Nander (Nathaniel) Frieder; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6423. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ivan B. Hofman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 6424. A bill for the relief of Edward White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6425. A bill for the relief of Clark Wiley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6426. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6427. A bill for the relief of the Amsterdam Building Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1877. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of various farmers to abolish the OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1878. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of John J. Sugar and 314 others, asking the Congress to pass legislation providing a pension of \$150 per month to railroad men of 30 years service or at 60 years of age with two-thirds of such pension payable to the widow of such a man, requesting that amendments to the foregoing effect be attached to House bill 1737, and protesting provisions of House bill 1362; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in mercy, love, and power, to whom all flesh shall come, we turn unfilled to Thee. For the beauty which fills the earth, for the love which hallows our homes, for the joy which springs from work well done, we thank Thee, the source of all gladness.

At this altar of Thy grace we pause with tasks waiting, lest with the light shining clear upon us we choose the dark. If in our frantic seeking for satisfactions and solutions we find all except Thee, we have nothing but vanity and our spirits remain still famished and athirst. For all life's quests illumine the darkness of our minds. And to those who by their counsels lead the peoples of the earth grant a right judgment in all things, O God, who in our private conduct and for the commonwealth maketh us both to will and to do those things that are good and acceptable in Thy sight. Through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 13, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 13, 1946, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1955. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5718. An act to facilitate the liquidation of Washington Railway & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4761) to expedite the availability of housing for veterans of World War II by expediting the production and allocation of materials for housing purposes and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORT OF CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5012.)

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES — DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 183)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce, amounting to \$2,436,000, for the fiscal year 1947, and drafts of proposed provisions in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Los Angeles (Calif.) Traffic Manager Conference relating to the coal strike; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Bayard, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures, and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the State Council of Maryland, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Frederick, Md., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3663) to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to reduce immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution adopted by the State Council of Maryland, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Frederick, Md., protesting against admission into the United States of East Indian people as immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting letter from Albert L. Cole, general manager of Reader's Digest, protesting against the labor conditions which exist in this country today. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Cole's letter printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE READER'S DIGEST,

Pleasantville, N. Y., May 7, 1946.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
The United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The coal strike has now reached the point where it is obvious that within a few days much of the Nation will be prostrate.

Our printers have advised us that they will very soon have to shut down their presses because of lack of power. They will not be able to print the Reader's Digest or any other of several publications for which they act as printers. The newspapers report that the railroads will soon have to stop, or at least curtail freight shipments and passenger service. And when goods cannot be moved, even starvation for people in some parts of the country may follow.

We respectfully urge you in your position as a representative of the American people to do something to pass the laws necessary to make it impossible for disaster to overtake this Nation merely because machinery does not exist for the settlement of disputes involving rates of pay and other working conditions. The courts of our land settle other disputes and, when necessary, take men's lives as a part of a judicial decision. Why can't disputes involving rates of pay and other conditions of employment be settled on a basis of impartial justice?

Sincerely,

ALBERT L. COLE.

THE LABOR SITUATION RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the National Industrial Traffic League in convention at Chicago, May 7, 1946.

In view of the present national curtailment and possible paralysis of the Nation's transportation facilities caused

by the national coal strike, the league, composed of some 1,300 industrial traffic managers, call upon the Congress of the United States at once to curb such strikes.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Nation's transportation facilities already are alarmingly curtailed and face complete paralysis in the near future due to the unprecedented national coal strike; and

Whereas it is our duty and obligation through the National Industrial Traffic League and other channels of constructive effort to see that adequate, economical, safe, and efficient transportation by common carriers be made continuously available to the shippers of the Nation; and

Whereas the issues involved in this strike threaten national economic strangulation and the extension of a precedent already set, of usurpation by selfish organized minorities of the power to tax, which is the power to destroy; and

Whereas the impact of this strike has directly or indirectly affected the constitutional rights and privileges of all the people of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Industrial Traffic League in general membership meeting here assembled, That as protectors of shippers' interests in adequate, economical, safe, and efficient transportation services by the Nation's common carriers, and as American citizens who individually are injuriously affected by such strikes of national scope and effect, we do officially and in our individual rights call upon the Congress of the United States at once so to curb the power of any organized selfish minority, that they shall not commit acts which would tend to paralyze the Nation's arteries of commerce, to strangle its national economy, to usurp the power to tax which the people have delegated solely to local, State, and Federal governments, or to vitiate the constitutional rights of the citizenry at large; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded at once to Members of both Houses of Congress, to the President of the United States, and to members of the league, with suggestion for similar action by their local and regional organizations, and to the press.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Patents:

H. R. 1654. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1333).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Anna Blanchard and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5744. A bill to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WHEELER introduced Senate bill (S. 2193) to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2194. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to eliminate the conditions and limitations relating to the use of certain lands previously conveyed to the city of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2195. A bill relating to the naval service of Lt. (jg) Warren DeForest Sargeant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2196. A bill to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would provide payment to all enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for accumulated leave, known generally as terminal-leave pay.

This legislation is necessary if we are going to treat all men alike. I realize fully that the Army and Navy believe that there must be a distinction between officers and enlisted personnel while in the service but I do not subscribe to that theory being followed when men are discharged. Both officers and men are American citizens with equal rights and equal responsibilities, and are certainly entitled to equal treatment. If it is right and proper to grant officers payment for accumulated leave, then it is right and proper that all other personnel in the services should have the same payment.

I am well aware that the War and Navy Departments have objected to this kind of legislation in the past, claiming that it is impossible of effective administration. That sort of objection does not seem tenable to me, regardless of the difficulties involved. If it is just that such payment should be made, then we should not wink at the injustice by claiming that it is difficult to make the payments. The men and women who served in the armed forces at great sacrifice of earnings and in danger of their lives are at the very least entitled to be compensated for the time they served without having taken leave. As I see it, this proposes simple justice and I shall do all I can to see to it that service personnel get that justice.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2193) to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOORE submitted six amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which

were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 5718. An act to facilitate the liquidation of Washington Railway & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EMERGENCY FOOD COLLECTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address in behalf of the emergency food collection, delivered by him in Worcester, Mass., on May 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—EDITORIAL FROM MOBILE (ALA.) REGISTER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Register Replies to Senator's Challenge on St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Register of Mobile, Ala., issue of May 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD quotations from the program on the occasion of a dinner given in honor of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, of Washington, D. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL PAY BILL AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—LETTER BY MISS MARY ANDERSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Christian Science Monitor by Miss Mary Anderson, former Director, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, on the subject of the equal pay bill and the equal rights amendment, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF FACTS ABOUT WATCHES—ADVERTISEMENT OF AMERICAN WATCH ASSEMBLERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Statement of Facts About Watches," by the American Watch Assemblers' Association, published in the New York Times of April 11, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Florida has the

floor. If he will yield to me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoe	Reed
Brewster	Huffman	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Shipstead
Butler	Langer	Stanfill
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Taylor
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Tydings
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wheeler
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Green	Morse	White
Guffey	Murdock	Wiley
Gurney	Murray	Willis
Hart	Myers	Wilson
Hatch	O'Daniel	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BELBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for the purpose of having two conference reports considered and acted upon?

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there will be no objection to the conference reports, and that they will be acted upon immediately. They have been gone over very carefully by the conferees on the part of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on House bill 5604, the second supplemental surplus appropriation rescission bill.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is privileged.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state to the Senator from North Dakota that I am merely asking to have action taken on two conference reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that they are privileged matters.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5604) reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11 and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Naval Training Station, Port Deposit, Maryland, 1946, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946, \$200,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$125,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "... and neither the appropriation nor contractual authorization under this head shall be available after February 25, 1946, for the acquisition of land (other than for the authorized vessel-berthing program), except in pursuance of a specific appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$190,784,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$652,986,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,015,379,424"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 20, 23, and 30.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action respecting the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5604, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

May 9, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 5604) reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "canceled", insert "... *Provided further*, That the rescission of \$13,657,000 in the appropriation 'Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946,' hereinbefore provided for in this act, is hereby canceled, and such appropriation is hereby increased by \$11,763,480 by transfer of such an amount from the reduction hereinbefore provided for in this act in the 'Naval Stock Fund,' instead of such amount of \$11,763,480 being carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line

of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "amended" insert: "... *Provided*, That of the reduction of \$1,080,000,000 made in the appropriation 'Defense aid-lend-lease' under title I of this act, \$135,000,000 shall be transferred to the credit of the appropriation 'United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1944-46,' instead of being carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30.

The motion was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5890) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 10, 11, 14, 36, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$5,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$837,127"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 40, 46, and 62.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. To what appropriation bill does the conference report relate?

Mr. McKELLAR. The second deficiency appropriation bill. This is the final conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed by all the members of the conference committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. There was no objection, as I recall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5890, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

May 8, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40 and 46 to the bill (H. R. 5890) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "Provided, That, effective May 1, 1946, the appropriation for salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol, contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, shall provide as follows: 'For the Architect of the Capitol, Assistant Architect of the Capitol (whose compensation shall be at the rate of \$7,000 per annum), Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant, and other personal services at rates of pay provided by law; and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall act as Architect of the Capitol during the absence or disability of that official or whenever there is no Architect, and, in case of the absence or disability of the Assistant Architect, the Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant shall so act; \$66,700.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "Provided further, That until December 31, 1945, upon request of the United Nations and its agreement to pay the cost and expenses

thereof either by advancement of funds or by reimbursement, any executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the United States Government may furnish or may procure and furnish supplies and equipment to the United Nations and, when reimbursements are made by the United Nations, such reimbursements shall be credited to the appropriations, funds, or accounts utilized for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received from that organization."

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to thank the Senator from Florida for his kindness in yielding so that the two conference reports could be acted upon.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me so I may submit two matters? One is privileged and the other is necessary because of the impending date deadline.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. First, Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives setting forth its action on Senate Joint Resolution 159 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, to which were, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term 'child' includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped."

And after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I am going to move that the Senate agree to the House amendments; but before I do that I should like to make an explanation of what I believe is the feeling

and the will of the Senate Military Affairs Committee in regard to this motion.

In the first place the ideas of the Senate Military Affairs Committee have already been expressed and are on the calendar in the form of what is known as Senate bill 2057. When I attempt to express the will of the Senate Military Affairs Committee I entertain no doubt at all that the committee has not changed its mind in regard to Senate bill 2057; that it will attempt to bring Senate bill 2057 into being as the law of the land.

Mr. President, in order to be fair to everyone I must also say that the motion to accept the amendments of the House of Representatives is acquiesced in by the committee because of the extreme situation due to the date line we face, and not because the committee is in agreement with the House amendments. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that any member of the committee is happy either over the motion I have to make or the result of the action of the House.

Also, in order to be fair, I should explain to the Senate that we hope to be able to take up Senate bill 2057 before the Draft Act comes to an end, in accordance with the action of the House and the action of the Senate the other day, that is, before July 1.

I shall say a word or two in explanation of the action taken by the committee. As everyone knows, the Draft Act will come to an end by law tonight at midnight if some action is not taken here today and if the President does not approve that action. Everyone knows that the draft act is an extremely complicated act. It not only calls men into the service, but it also attempts to take care of men after they have completed their service. Those sections of the act which are related to the veteran's welfare must in some way be kept alive, and it will be our aim to keep them alive, so that no person who has been drafted and who has entered into a contract with his Government under which his Government has made certain promises to him will lose the benefit of such promises.

There is, of course, a question in the minds of all of us as to the power and authority of the President of the United States to transfer, before midnight tonight, certain activities under the provisions of the act in order that rights and privileges may not be lost. There is so much doubt in our minds that it seems to us to be wise to extend the act as it is until July 1. It will then die by law on July 1; but at any rate it can die in an orderly manner, which will allow certain adjustments to be made to take care of the rights of those who have already served their Government, and we shall at least have another opportunity of reviewing the actual need for the extension.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 159.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator might state, if he sees fit, that the statement which he has made today was made after a meeting of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at which there were present a goodly number of members, and at which the membership of the committee gave serious consideration to the question of the House amendments to the joint resolution which the Senate passed last week.

The statement of the Senator from Utah has been made with the full authorization of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; and in making the statement he is stating to the Senate and to the country that we are proposing to accept the House amendments not because we favor them, not because we believe that those amendments are right or should be written into the law, but simply because of the compulsion of the emergency, due to the fact that the Draft Act expires at midnight tonight. In accepting these House amendments we in no way preclude or estop ourselves from endeavoring to do that which we think ought to be done in connection with the extension of the Draft Act. At the very first opportunity we shall endeavor to bring before the Senate the so-called Gurney bill, reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, with reference to the extension of the Draft Act, which bill is now on the Senate Calendar, and which, because of the press of other legislation, we have been unable to get before the Senate. But as soon as we can we will endeavor to bring that bill before the Senate for passage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making our position doubly clear.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to say something about this matter, for one reason, in order to show that the action of the committee is wholly nonpartisan. There is no element of party interest in this question. As we have done heretofore with respect to great measures which determine the attitude of the United States in the family of nations at this critical time, Republicans and Democrats have acted together in an attempt to find the way out of a dilemma.

I venture the opinion that the Senate has never been in a worse dilemma in a parliamentary sense than it is today in connection with this measure. We have discussed all possible ways of endeavoring to express our opinions by action with respect to the amendments adopted by the House, and we have finally reluctantly concluded that the only way available to us to do so is by statements on the floor of the Senate in connection with a vote to extend the draft law, if possible, for the meager time between now and July 1, 1946.

Mr. President, the seriousness of this situation is illustrated by some simple facts. Even with the draft law in existence as it stands on our books, there has been a descending scale of voluntary enlistments since last October, until during the month of April we succeeded

in obtaining only 60,000 voluntary enlistments. The requirement was 185,000 for the month of April. Through the Selective Service as it is, and by means also of relaxing the physical standards and reviewing the IV-F cases, we were not able to fill the quota for the month of April. All we could get was a total, in round numbers, of 40,000 in addition to those who had enlisted, making approximately 100,000 recruitments for our armed forces, whereas we needed 185,000.

Mr. President, another vital fact to consider is this: The effect of the amendment relating to age is practically to prostrate the efforts of this great Government to maintain the standard of efficiency of the armed forces for the purpose of carrying out our commitments in the occupation of enemy territory, our own defense, our garrisoning of island bases, and our fulfillment of our commitment to the United Nations. The effect of what we do today by accepting the particular amendment relating to the age brackets is to cut down the possibility of obtaining selectees to 3,000 a month. Why is this? It is because during the past years men of 18 and 19 years of age have been selected; and all those who are 20 years of age, which is the age at which inductions would begin under this amendment, are now in the service, except those who have been deferred for one cause or another or those who have been reclassified by having regained their health or by having become competent, whereas they were incompetent at the age of 18 years. Those may not be all the reasons, but they are offered for consideration in regard to the dilemma in which we find ourselves at this moment. We will need 30,000 a month as a continuing program, after we have attained the number for July 1, 1946, namely, 1,550,000. We shall need 30,000 continually after that. Under the joint resolution with the proposed amendments all we could obtain would be 3,000, because the great pool, the great resource for manpower lies in the age group of 18 and 19 years.

We must not by our action give out to the world or to those brave boys who now are still in the service the impression or entitle them to form the opinion that this great Nation has become so enfeebled that it cannot maintain by one method or another which is strictly within the Constitution the necessary manpower to carry out our commitments for the great purpose of establishing security and peace in the world. The main objective, of course, is to create such a situation, by negotiations now going on, that we shall not have to have an Army or a Navy or an Air Force for the purpose of waging war; that we shall have to maintain only such armed forces as amount to peace forces, and tend to prevent the use of war as a means of settling disputes among nations. In other words, our greatest objective of all is peace. We aim to give our Government in the negotiations with the great powers of the world a standing which will command their respect, and we know very well, as a practical matter, that our conduct today subjects us to their utter contempt for voluntarily putting ourselves in a

position of being one of the weakest of all the negotiators. I wonder how the negotiators in Paris look upon the action of this country, which within one year had risen to the pinnacle of leadership in thought and in political power in the world. Do we wonder that they shoot at our planes as they come down to land on our own runways in Europe? How much cuffing about will now follow, so long as this country pursues the course of reducing its strength to the point of subjecting it to utter contempt?

Mr. President, if there is any effect in what I have to say I wish it to be that we have served notice to those over there who are vis-a-vis in those negotiations that the present action does not represent the considered judgment of the Senate, and that the Senate—whatever it does as a matter of expediency to save some parts of the wreck, and as a pure matter of salvage—still is determined to bring up this matter and within the earliest convenient time to pass a general bill with respect to the maintenance of the necessary manpower to keep this Nation strong and competent and give it some authority in the negotiations it is conducting and to keep it competent to defend itself if such an event should occur that the use of armed force would be necessary.

So I say for the Republicans on the committee that we reluctantly join in this motion. For varying and differing reasons on our side, we oppose these amendments, and probably we shall soon join with our Democratic friends on the committee in bringing to the attention of the Senate a review of these amendments along with consideration of general measures that are adapted to peacetime for maintaining the manpower of our country in the armed forces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is little that I can add to what the distinguished Senators who have preceded me have said. However, I wish to make my position perfectly clear, namely, that I merely acquiesce in the House amendments. The amendments destroy everything selective service stands for, except to keep the offices and the boards and the records.

The Senator from Vermont has spoken of a dilemma. There will be a dilemma in the Army and Navy for those who have served long and well and faithfully when they find out that those who come on today are unwilling, because of congressional action and because of their own positions, to take their places in the armed forces and thus enable the married men to come home and also to enable those who have had long and distinguished service to return to their homes. Those who are in our Army and Navy believe that in this great democracy of ours the burdens as well as the joys should be shared.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Alabama did not mention the fact that some 200,000 students who are to graduate from college or high school during the coming month have

been deferred in order that they might complete their education, and will not be selected because of the action which is to be taken in regard to the Selective Service Act. As a result, they will be put in a privileged class. Oh, yes, Mr. President, the Selective Service took those from the cotton mills and took those from the farm or wherever they may have been. They were not deferred. They were not completing their education, and so they were selected. But those of 18 or 19 years of age who were completing their education—the 200,000 of whom the Senator from Colorado has so ably spoken—have been deferred. With the July extension they would have been taken, but now they are to be deferred forever. Mr. President, injustice never pays.

I may add another word for those who may volunteer for the Army and the Navy. Some like the Navy; some prefer the Marine Corps; some prefer the Artillery; some prefer other branches of the services. There will be a general slump in volunteering, not only for the Army but for the Navy and the Marine Corps as well. As the Senator from Vermont said, the Army call for this month amounted to 125,000 volunteers, so they hoped, and 60,000 selectees, or a total of 185,000. That was the call for April. Of the total of 185,000 comprising the call, the armed forces got 101,000; and in that 101,000 there were a good many duplications due to the fact that when some are selected they are permitted to volunteer for service for the 18-month period.

Mr. President, I join in the hope that the day is not far away when justice will be done to those who have made sacrifices, and that they may have an opportunity to return to their homes and to resume their education.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to our leader the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], as well as all the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, for the assurance which they have given, not only to us but to the country and to the world, that the precipitate and unfortunate action which we are compelled to take does not represent the settled viewpoint of the Senate of the United States and, in my judgment, does not represent the settled viewpoint of the country as a whole.

It seems regrettable and rather difficult of understanding that the other House did not accept the joint resolution extending the Selective Service Act for 6 weeks. I do not criticize that body, although I understand that in the debate yesterday considerable criticism was made of the Senate on the ground that the Senate could have reached this sub-

ject and have disposed of it sooner if it had wished to do so.

Mr. President, neither body is perfect. In determining what course should be pursued, and in view of the deadline at midnight tonight, I imagine that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs was compelled to give consideration to the fact that if we should ask for a conference and return the resolution to the other House, it would be impractical to have a conference today except by unanimous consent of the other body, so the deadline would have been reached anyway. Criticism of the Senate for delay may have been justified, but it was very unbecoming of the other body to indulge in it.

Regardless of that fact, Mr. President, I see no other action which the Senate can take at this moment. I am happy that members of the committee have announced that what is being done is being done under compulsion. I am sure the Senate will act under compulsion, under circumstances which it cannot now control, and which might have been different if the Senate had heretofore proceeded in a different manner. However, Mr. President, all that is water over the dam, and I do not make the statement in any spirit of criticism.

If I am incorrect about this I should like to be put right, but it seems to me that since the end of the war our Nation has been more precipitant in its effort to cripple its power and its standing among the nations of the world than has any other nation which fought with us during the war. I do not recall that any other nation among the Allied Nations has been so precipitant and has run over itself so rapidly in trying to disband as fast and as completely as possible its military and naval organizations.

I realize that pressures are being brought to bear upon us. We are supposed to be able to resist some of them. I have received many letters in regard to maintaining an army in Japan, in China, in the islands of the sea, and wherever else we have military forces, and in those letters there were requests for an explanation of the situation. I have tried as honestly and as sincerely as I could to answer every letter which I received and explain the necessity for our maintaining sufficient military and naval power to carry out our obligations all over the world.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a moment so that I may propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall endeavor to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to know whether we, who are Members of the Senate, have tried to ascertain whether the House, inasmuch as it is unwilling to agree to extending the date until July 1, would be willing to agree to extend it until June 15. In my opinion, 2 or 3 weeks would be a very important contribution to the time in which the subject may be considered. I may say to the majority leader that I personally feel the same as he has expressed himself. I believe that the

present is one of the most unfortunate situations that have occurred in the Senate since I became a Member of it. I should like to know if the majority leader, who is skilled in parliamentary procedure and the art of conference, believes there is any chance of compromising this matter in order to afford us 2 or 3 weeks in which to give the subject a little more mature consideration?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not conferred with Members of the other House as to whether they would be willing to accept a short period of extension. They had an opportunity to do so when the joint resolution was before the House, and they did not do so.

Mr. HAWKES. I know that the Senator is just as anxious as am I to obtain a little time in which to consider further the matter. I wonder if it is now too late—the Senator knows better than I do—to endeavor to ascertain whether the House and the Senate cannot agree upon some date between now and July 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we had 2 days for a conference, we might take a chance. But if the act is not extended today, it will expire at midnight tonight. I have no way of knowing whether a conference would be agreed to if we were to ask for one. If the other House refused to meet with us in conference where would we be left? The Military Affairs Committee has undoubtedly canvassed all possibilities and has decided that it would be the better part of wisdom to come before the Senate and make the motion which has been made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HAWKES. I have found during my life that sometimes when things seemed impossible of accomplishment they could be accomplished very quickly if they had in them the essence of justice and right. I think the issues today are on the side of justice and right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am sorry that I cannot give him a categorical answer to his question.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I have received perhaps as many letters with regard to this subject as has any other Member of the Senate. I have undertaken to explain to each correspondent why it is necessary to maintain as many forces as we now have in the Army and the Navy, and why we must keep them where they are now located. I have not yet received from a single correspondent any criticism after having taken him into my confidence and explained why it was necessary to maintain as large a force as we are now maintaining in different parts of the world. I believe that Members of both branches of Congress have an obligation to take persons into their confidence and explain things which those persons may not be able to understand because of their distance from the legislative process here in Washington.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion, but I join with all of those who have indicated that a vote for the motion will be no indication of the final judgment of the Senate on this important subject. I believe that whenever the American people are made fully aware of the

necessities and the obligations as they exist, they will rise and meet them, now that the war is over, no less than they rose to the occasion while the conflict was in progress.

I wish also to have it understood among foreign nations, whether they are in conference now or may be in conference later, that no implications are to be drawn and no conclusions are to be reached by any of them because of the situation in which we now find ourselves in regard to the matter now before the Senate.

With reference to the bill on the calendar, I wish to state that if the conference report is agreed to, the Draft Act will expire again on the 1st of July. When that date arrives we shall be confronted with another question of time. We are in the same situation with reference to the Stabilization Act, which expires on June 30. That act is not ready for consideration by the Senate. It is still in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the chances are that it will not be ready to be reported to the Senate this week, and probably not before week after next. In the meantime I should like to urge Senators to facilitate consideration of the bill now under consideration, which is controversial and which will involve some debate, and that we expedite the consideration of the draft measure as much as possible, having due regard for the rights of Senators to debate it. I do not want the Senate to get into such a situation that we will have a foot race between the OPA and the further extension of the draft, when both of them are about to expire again at the end of June. So I appeal to Senators to help facilitate the consideration of the pending measures.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think, in view of what has been said, I should say now, before I yield to any other Senator, a word in regard to the parliamentary situation. It would be a very simple matter to throw the draft bill into conference. The House has already acted and sent over to us amendments to the Draft Act, embodying certain ideas. By laying aside the unfinished business we can act on S. 2057 very expeditiously. That will throw the two bills into conference, and we can spend, if necessary, the whole 6 weeks in working out a proper bill. As chairman of the committee, I am sure that our committee is ready to do that.

I say that merely to clear the minds of those Senators who have asked if there was not time between now and tonight to do something else. We can do that, and then we can take the whole 6 weeks in getting a perfected bill. From a parliamentary standpoint, it is very easy, if we could have Senate bill 2057 passed. Then if the House will go into conference with us on it, we can report back a bill which will be more than satisfactory, I am sure, to the country and fair to all concerned.

But, Mr. President, I have another obligation resting upon my shoulders. I do not want to talk about bill No. 2 until some action is taken on bill No. 1. The thing we have to do—and to that end these words of explanation have been given—is for us to accept the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution

159, and then we will have 6 weeks or more in which to work.

I do not make this explanation to cut off members of my committee who I know want to say something, but I do make it in answer to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and in answer to the appeal the Senator from Kentucky has made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I merely wish to make the record a little more clear as to the number of men coming into the Army and to utter a word of caution to those who may think that the Selective Service is merely a scheme to get men into the Army. We should not forget the Navy. The Navy has had volunteers right along, but possibly the same difficulty now confronting the Army will soon also confront the Navy.

In the month of April the call of the Army on Selective Service was for 125,000 men, and the Army expected 60,000 volunteers, making 185,000. The selective-service boards, anticipating that the Selective Service Act would expire on May 15, provided only 40,000. There were volunteers of 60,000, making a total of 100,000. So, we were 85,000 short in the month of April.

The Army demobilization schedule for May and June is predicated upon their receiving about 100,000 men in May and 90,000 men in June. They anticipated with the renewal of the Selective Service Act that they would have 50,000 volunteers in the month of May and would call on the Selective Service for an equal number of men. In June they estimated 40,000 volunteers, and their call on the Selective Service would be for 50,000.

Now we are short 85,000 for the month of April, and we cannot expect that the number of men we anticipated will enter the service in May and June, so there will be a great shortage during the time between now and when the Congress enacts the renewal of the selective service law.

It is a great opportunity for the young men of America to recognize the call of the Nation and to come forward and volunteer their services to replace the boys who have been in the service a long time. I think many of the young men of the Nation will recognize that call and we will have volunteering beyond what some of us may at the moment expect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that I should make before the Senate the statement which I made before the Senate Military Affairs Committee this morning as to my position upon the pending draft measure.

I am one of those who reluctantly voted for the action which was unanimously taken by the committee. It was unanimous because of the situation that has been explained by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. Different reasons were assigned by members of the committee for the positions assumed by them and for their attitude of reluctance.

I think that I should state frankly that when any law is written permanently upon the subject—and I wish it were written in the pending measure—it should provide for the immediate discharge from the Army of fathers. I wanted to offer an amendment to that effect, but I learned and knew how futile it would be to attempt thus to amend this measure.

Mr. President, I think the exemption of men with families from service in the Army is of far greater importance than the question of not drafting teen-age boys. Fathers who are held in the service through the draft and are prevented from returning to their homes and their families are caused by their Government to neglect a duty which when not performed certainly involves a national danger. So I say I want written into this measure a provision requiring the release from the armed services of men with children or a child. That would not call for any new classification, because already there are being released from the armed services men with three children.

Mr. President, I wish to address in particular a remark to the General Staff of the Army, which makes the rules for release of men from the Army. Even without it being written into the bill they should take steps, and they are justified in doing so, for the immediate release of fathers.

Upon this point let me call some figures to the attention of the Senate. In January of this year, 1946, we were told by the members of the General Staff that they expected enlistments by July 1 of this year of 650,000, and that upon that basis they would release from the Army all except 120,000 fathers by July 1946. Because of the unexpected number of enlistments, in March of this year they revised their figures, and said they expected 950,000 volunteers by July 1, 1946, 300,000 more than they had estimated in January. So, Mr. President, if they could release all but 120,000 fathers upon a basis of 650,000 volunteers, certainly they can release those 120,000 when they have increased their enlistment estimate by 300,000. I make these remarks because I want to call the attention of the Army to the fact that they can act upon this subject without legislation upon it.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the idea of a strong Army for the protection of this country, a strong Navy, and a strong Air Force, but I believe definitely that end can be attained through volunteers, and I believe my feeling is justified by the record that has been made since the voluntary enlistment bill was passed. As of April 30 of this year, 730,590 men had volunteered into the Army alone. More than 52 percent volunteered for 3 years' service. I had hoped that all inductions could be stopped, because I believe we will never get a volunteer army until the Army energizes and accelerates a plan to obtain volunteers.

March 8 of this year, without announcement to the public or to the Congress, the Army raised the passing mark on the classification test from 59 to 70, and thereby cut down the number of volunteers who enlisted in the Army. If the

Army is to follow that course of action, we will never get a volunteer army so long as we give them men through enforced service. The mark of 59 for a soldier was good enough during the war, it was good enough for the American Army prior to the war, but the officials felt they must raise it to 70, and the result was the cutting of the volunteer forces. If the Army is going to continue on that kind of policy the Army itself will be responsible for the lack of volunteers.

I hope, Mr. President, when permanent legislation is written upon this subject, between now and July the first, if the Army will not issue an order releasing from the service men who have children, that there will be written into the new bill a direction that they shall do so. I trust, further, that by that time we will see clearly that enforced service is not necessary longer in this country, and that we may have an army of volunteers sufficiently large to meet the needs of the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, I support the measure as now presented primarily for one reason, namely, that if we let the law die tonight, the veterans of this war will lose their rights of reemployment preferment. I do not want that to happen. I think a great wrong would be done to them. So I hope that the motion will be agreed to, and that those rights may be saved to the veteran, and that when we write legislation upon this subject of a permanent nature, we may then all have our opportunity to present the measures and provisions we think will meet the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the able majority leader and the Senator from Vermont have both expressed very clearly the serious situation in which this Nation has been placed as a result of the parliamentary situation. In consequence of that and of the action we are forced to take today, we have undoubtedly weakened ourselves in dealing with the critical international affairs which confront us.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has pointed out the problems of the fathers in the armed services, but I should not want this occasion to pass without saying a word on behalf of another group who perhaps are the forgotten men of the Army.

Overseas today, in Japan and in Germany, and in the other outposts where we find it necessary to keep our troops, are many single men who have had long months of service. Many of them have had combat service. They have not yet had the opportunity to marry and to raise families, and what has been done will be a serious blow to them. They have given some of the best months of their lives to this Republic, at great sacrifice, and I think they are deserving of better treatment than to be served notice that they may have to wait for a longer time because the Congress of the United States has not been able to meet a challenge which was very clearly before it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us the number of soldiers affected by the proposed legislation, who are now serving overseas or in this country and who expect to be discharged between now and July 1st?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not think any great number of soldiers will be affected. It is a matter of opinion. The Army has given us the figures as to the number needed to put the Army at a strength of 1,070,000 on the 1st of July 1947. They start out with the aim of having an Army of 1,500,000 on the 1st of July 1946.

I think—and this is merely an opinion—that, while, of course, it would be desirable to have all the volunteers and the inductees who are necessary to take the places of all those the Army desires to release, already the Army has done such a good job that not great numbers of men are to be affected as a result of the action taken today.

Mr. LUCAS. I gained the contrary impression from the statements made by other Senators.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The great problem is that of the difference between an Army of approximately 1,070,000 men on the 1st of July next year, and 1,500,000 on the 1st of July this year.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a fact, as I understand, that certain men will have to remain in the occupation zones and in the Army in this country as the result of the failure to draft 18- and 19-year-old men during the next 60 days.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We know that the Army will have 1,500,000 on the 1st of July this year, because they now have them, and they are going to reduce the number somewhat up to that date. So the number who will be affected between this year and next year is represented by approximately the difference between 1,500,000 and 1,070,000, and those who should be released will be released, and those who desire to come in by voluntary arrangement will enter the Army.

No matter how it is figured, it is not a great number of men, but the idea of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I know the idea of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is defending the proposal for us, is that we should not impose an injustice upon anyone if we can avoid it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have the Senator from South Dakota make a statement.

Mr. GURNEY. In reply to the Senator from Illinois, let me say that the length of service of 85,000 men in the Army was absolutely affected by the shortage in the number of men who entered the armed forces in April. They were short that many men. Some who are already in the Army will have to stay that much longer. Eighty-five thousand men must stay longer because of the shortage in the month of April. How many more will have to stay longer because of the shortages in May and June I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am still in the dark, and there is no adequate answer to my question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is no answer, because we are dealing with unknowns.

Mr. LUCAS. But it is a certainty that as a result of the failure to induct into the services during this month and up to July 1 boys 18 and 19 years old, some men must take their place, and those men are already in the Army, and so far as their service is concerned they are going to have to stay in the Army that much longer than they would have had to stay if the House had accepted the extension measure the Senate passed the other day. In other words, the men who have served long and faithfully will now serve for the boys who would have gone into the Army at the ages of 18 and 19.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, but I cannot give the definite number of men involved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, men now in the Army also will have to continue to serve for boys who would have been drafted before and would have been in the service except for the fact that we deferred them so they could finish their college educations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I simply cannot understand it all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The enlistments as of July 1, 1946, estimated by the General Staff of the Army, will be 950,000. In addition to that, there will be enlistments in Philippine Scouts to the number of 50,000; making a total of a million men. Those are enlistments entirely; they are not draftees.

Now with respect to inductees. It has been somewhat of a surprise apparently to some that only 40,000 were taken in in the month of April. Senators will recall that after the fall of Japan the President fixed the monthly quota at 51,000, as I recall, and selective service has been taking about 35,000 a month. So 40,000 in April was really an increase in the number of inductees. That was in addition, as I have said, to the 60,000 volunteers. There is some overlapping there because some of the inductees volunteered. So if we have had 35,000 a month, it means that within the past year, as of July 1, 420,000 have been inducted. That would make a figure of 1,420,000 men who had volunteered and had been inducted, and who had not up to that time served more than a year in the services. That is a big army. Of course, there is some overlap, and I cannot tell how many of the 1,420,000 represent inductees and how many represent voluntary enlistments. So therefore servicemen of long service certainly ought to be out now, or definitely by July 1 of this year.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the distinguished Senator if the Army contemplates final termination of the Selective

Service Act, the Draft Act, at any fixed time or any particular time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Army, of course, has made its plans for May 15, because that is the way the law reads. The Army has held out its hopes for July 1, because that is what the Senate measure provided.

Mr. GEORGE. Of the current year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; and that is what the Senate joint resolution would do. Under it the Draft Act would come to an end unless other legislation were passed between now and July 1.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Army at any time ever suggested a termination date for the Selective Service Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the Army has not. Various suggestions have been made by different witnesses. The Army has approved a measure which would extend the act for a year. The War Department asked for such action.

Mr. GEORGE. I am curious to know if the Army regards the Selective Service System as permanent. That is what the American people are anxious to know, I may say to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I hope the Army does not regard the selective service as a permanent system.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it not time that the Congress and the country were given rather definite advice on so important and so vital a matter as the drafting in peacetime of young men into the Army?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So far as civilians can give advice to the Army it has been given, that it should not depend upon selective service. What is more, many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee said that they would rather have a volunteer army than an inducted army. What is still more, it has been pointed out time and time again to the Army that this is a subject upon which Congress must pass. No one has suggested a permanent selective service except one witness who suggested that it be continued indefinitely. No one agreed with that suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. Does it not seem obvious to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has given a great deal of thought to the subject, that so long as we have a mixture of the compulsory system with the volunteer system we are not going to secure the best results?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has put into exact words the greatest of all problems facing the Army of the United States. We are fast coming to the position, due to the selective-service functioning in peacetime, where all those in the Army of the United States who command volunteered to command, and where all those who are commanded in the Army of the United States will be inducted to be commanded. Mr. President, if a nation cannot continue half slave and half free, neither can it continue, under such a system, to have an army which is at the highest peak of morale.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia has asked a very pertinent question. I think the answer is that the Army has declared that it favors a volunteer army, an army composed of personnel raised by the volunteer system rather than by the Selective Service System. The Army has said, however, that in order to do the jobs it now has to do and in order to meet the commitments which have been imposed upon it, it must have an army of July 1 of this year, 1946, of 1,550,000 men; and that in order to meet its commitments and to do the work required of it, it must have an army a year from now, July 1, 1947, of 1,070,000 men. It would rather have a volunteer army. It hoped that Congress would do everything it could to stimulate and encourage the raising of a volunteer army; but that if it is to perform the tasks assigned it and meet its commitments it must have the number of men I have stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wanted to make the same statement that the Senator from Alabama has made, with this addition, that the Military Affairs Committee warned the War Department time and time again that it ought not to depend upon an extension of the Draft Act on May 15; but it is also true that the War Department asked that it be given a 1-year extension of the Draft Act.

In regard to the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to how the action of the House and the Senate will affect the situation, the answer, of course, may vary with private opinion of different members of the committee who have studied the question. In my opinion, 200,000 replacements are affected. The size of the army is not affected. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was entirely mistaken when he said that we are weakening the hands of the Secretary of State and our diplomats in France by this action, because the Army is going to have the size army it says it needs, regardless of this action.

The thing which is affected is replacements. The proposed action means that 120,000 fathers who should be discharged from the Army the 1st of July, and perhaps 80,000 combat troops and men with long service, will not be discharged, as they had hoped. That is about the whole story.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The fathers to whom the Senator has referred, and the men with long service, will not be discharged. They cannot be discharged, and they will have to serve in the places of 200,000 men who were subject to draft and who would have been drafted before this but for the fact that we deferred their service to permit them to finish their college education.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that throughout the country there is an unusual interest in boys who are 18 or 19 years old. I

can understand why a certain amount of pressure comes from mothers and fathers with respect to those boys, and why such pressure has its influence upon Members of Congress. But I wish to make what I believe to be a pertinent observation. We must also take into consideration the mothers, fathers, and wives of the 200,000 men who are left in the Army and are serving in the places of a couple of hundred thousand boys who have performed no military service. This is one of those things which work both ways. It is a two-edged sword.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. In that connection the Senator from Illinois will no doubt be interested to know that the Gurney bill for the extension of the draft which the Senate committee reported, and which is now on the calendar, provides, as I recall, for the discharge on August 1 of approximately 120,000 fathers, and, beginning October 1, the discharge of men who have had 18 months' service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. How many volunteers are in the Army at the present time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. By the 1st of June there will be 950,000.

Mr. LUCAS. We should certainly be rid of selective service by June 1947, or before then, if the Army needs only a little more than 1,000,000 men to take care of the situation at that time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think we should keep the record straight. We must remember that some of the men who volunteered did so last September, and many of them volunteered for only 18 months. Their 18 months might well expire before July 1, 1947. I did not want the impression to be created that, come what may, we might have sufficient volunteers to provide an Army of 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947.

Another thing we must remember is that we cannot have 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947, and then on July 2, July 4, July 5, or July 10 drop far below 1,070,000. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows, much depends upon the jobs and commitments imposed on the Army, upon what we do about overseas garrisons, upon what we do about the armed forces we now have in defeated enemy territory, and many other things which might change during the next year, and which might have a determining effect. So far as the Army can now see, it must have 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947; but that does not mean only on that date. It undoubtedly means for several months afterward.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is a fair statement to make and a logical conclusion to reach that if the rate of enlistment continues during the next year as it has during the past year, we shall have a sufficient number of men in 1947 to take care of the needs of the Army, through the voluntary system.

Mr. HILL. With respect to the rate of enlistment, of course the Senator recognizes that the rate of enlistment has de-

clined very much. Yesterday Representative SPARKMAN, of Alabama, in the debate in the House, made the following statement:

Our heaviest month for volunteers was in November of last year. In November 1945 we had nearly 185,000 volunteers. But listen to how the number has fallen off month by month: December, 131,000; January, 113,000; February, 93,000; March, 73,000; April, 63,000. You can see where that curve is leading; it is leading to a dangerous situation.

We must remember also that the effect of adopting the House amendments and no longer drafting boys of 18 or 19 will undoubtedly be substantially to reduce voluntary enlistments, because many men in that age group have volunteered because they realized that if they did not volunteer they would be drafted.

Mr. LUCAS. If we do not solve some of our economic problems there will be plenty of volunteers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this seems to be an anomalous situation. Apparently the Senate is about to take action unanimously on a proposal with which not a single Senator has expressed agreement. Not a single Senator has approved the proposed action. That is certainly a very extraordinary situation. Not one voice has been raised in behalf of the merits of the proposal which the committee asks us to approve. That fact certainly invites exploration. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has made a very impressive, and almost alarming, statement as to the situation in which we shall be left.

Reference has been made to the other body. While we do not need to hold any brief for that body, the fact remains that that body did take action in this matter more than 4 weeks ago and sent the measure over here. For the remaining 4 weeks the entire responsibility for drifting over what is now alleged to be a Niagara Falls rests upon those in this body who have not given an opportunity for consideration. I think that should be made very plain before the Congress and the country, in justice to all concerned, and that those responsible for determining the program of this body should give us as plausible an explanation as possible as to why this question has not previously been considered. It seems to me that that is a question which the country is going to ask.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. First, in response to the pertinent remarks made by the able Senator from Maine, what the Senator has said emphasizes the fact that eventually the time will have to be recognized as having arrived when the rules of the Senate will have to be adapted to the necessity of disposing of public business.

We debated the British loan in the Senate for a little more than a month. I am not making any point of the fact that we did not stay in session every day, nor of the fact that the rules of the Senate and the arrangement of the duties of Senators have been so imperfect in the past that we were distracted by many

interruptions of committee work and other things during the course of that debate. I hope, by the early adoption of the La Follette committee report, that it will be possible for us to segregate our weeks into certain days for committee meetings, certain days for Senate sessions, and perhaps even night sessions, and that it will be possible for us to expedite our business. But we can never transact the public business with the dispatch which the public demand requires until we have such rules that the leadership of the Senate can outline and lay out a program for the Senate's business, and then require some reasonable observance of that program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maine well recognizes the fact that after a bill once comes before this body, unless the leadership feels that it should be laid aside, or can well be laid aside, there is no way by which the leadership can determine when there shall be action on that bill. We still have free and unlimited debate in this body. Senators can continue to do what they did in regard to the British loan, namely, speak as long and practically as many times as they wish to.

There may be a question as to whether we should have laid the British loan measure aside. There were many Senators who felt that, important as was the extension of the Selective Service System, it was no more important than the British loan. To lay the British loan measure aside after we had once begun its consideration would have been more unfortunate—perhaps even more tragic insofar as our foreign relations are concerned and insofar as the part which we may be playing in the affairs of the world and in trying to build the peace at this time is concerned—than to let the Selective Service Act expire. Surely there was much to be said in favor of keeping the British loan measure before this body until it was finally disposed of.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me to conclude, I shall appreciate it very much; and I am sorry to have interrupted him so long.

I thoroughly subscribe to what the able Senator from Alabama has said. The answer is not in laying aside one piece of legislation for another piece of legislation, but the answer lies in making it possible for the leadership to budget in some reasonable measure the length of time available for debate on pending measures, and then to adhere to the budget which has been established.

To recur to the pending measure, Mr. President, let me say that I do not understand why there is anything so important about the labor bill which is the unfinished business that would give it priority of consideration over the emergency of providing an army for the United States of America.

There is another anomalous situation—and I do not say this because I am not in favor of some of the amendments which have been proposed and some which will be proposed to the committee bill dealing with labor—which we now

are allowing ourselves to present. Everyone admits the folly of the United States military policy that is embodied in this bill, and yet we are about to proceed for days and perhaps for weeks to debate a rather vain labor bill, after sacrificing the national interest—namely, the national security—and possibly endangering the future peace of the United States and of the world.

I would certainly be one of those who would look with great favor upon a request by the Senator from Utah, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that the Senate put first things first. If this matter is of the importance that has been suggested, it should be given that degree of priority on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. President, if I may make one further observation, I shall not interrupt any more. The third consideration I submit is that, although I may not have been fully informed as to what our representatives are doing in respect to foreign affairs, nevertheless, frankly, I have been a little disappointed that there has not appeared in the newspapers, at least so that we might know about it or so that we could obtain the information otherwise, news that our Government has been making a determined, persistent, and effective effort, in collaboration with Great Britain and Russia, by which all nations could reduce their military establishments. That may have been tried and there may have been a failure on the part of our foreign-policy-making officials; but I should like to know whether our Secretary of State has made an appeal to the British and the Russian Governments, and also to other governments insofar as they, too, are in the scheme, that all of us shall abandon compulsory military training and that all of us shall agree upon a limited personnel for military forces. I do not know when we are ever going to get around to it if we do not start rather soon. I am not complaining and I do not mean to criticize our State Department, but I wish to know whether a determined effort is being made to relieve the taxpayers and the young men of this country from the continuing burden of military service in peacetime, after we have won the greatest war in history.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the line the distinguished Senator from Florida has been speaking, let me say I am sure he recognizes the fact that, no matter how strong an army or navy or an air force we have, throttling of the industrial capacity of this Nation would cut a hole in the dikes of our national defense. The reason why the unfinished business—not the selective-service measure, but the labor measure which is the unfinished business—is before the Senate of the United States is that the economic life of the Nation was being slowly but surely strangled; and the issue with which the Senate was confronted and is now confronted is whether any man or any group of men or any organization has the right

to use his or its power to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Florida, not with the idea of educating him, for that is something I would not undertake to do, but for the purpose of telling him that in the Committee on Military Affairs the subject he has mentioned was considered, with respect to its bearing upon the number of men—that is, the minimum number—estimated as necessary for the carrying out of our commitments. I refer to our commitments at home and abroad. Among the assumptions indulged was the very favorable one, I think so far as to the United States is concerned, that within a reasonable time we would be able to complete the definitive treaties of peace with respect to Austria and Italy, for example, and thereupon withdraw our troops from those countries.

Already we have discovered that that assumption was not well founded. We are not going to be able to make the progress with those treaties of peace that we assumed we would make. In the meantime I have seen it reported that the Secretary of State of the United States has made proposals for the withdrawal of troops from different places around the world.

In the interest of peace, in the interest of the theory of having a universal arrangement which will be effective in the cause of security and peace, instead of unilateral arrangements made by great nations for themselves, is it not wise, as a practical question which we must face, for us to occupy those enemy countries with our troops so long as our representatives are vis-à-vis with the representatives of other nations in the negotiations which are going on there? It is a practical question. It is one which I think carries its own answer. For example, what kind of a picture would be presented to the negotiators if our troops were withdrawn from the position which they occupy with respect to Trieste and the boundary there which is under dispute? What position would this country be in if we removed our troops from the American occupation zone in Germany, and if France kept her troops there, and if Russia kept hers there, and if Britain kept hers there?

Mr. President, these questions are vital to us. All we can do in passing on the question of manpower, as I see it, is to consider these matters, not in the light most favorable to us, but in the reasonable light which leads us to believe that for some time to come the figures 1,550,000 as of July 1, 1946, and 1,070,000 as of July 1, 1947, are certainly the minimum, and that there is a possibility that we shall need more.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] wishes to obtain the floor in order to speak upon another matter. I think that before my motion is put to a vote I should at least make another statement.

All my life I have been trained in what some persons call science. It is extremely difficult for me to talk about unknowns. Therefore, I cannot project myself into the future and state what will take place in the middle of next month in regard to international relations, the Army, or anything else. There is one thing, however, which is known and which is based on facts. Neither the world, nor even the American people, will decide with regard to the strength of the United States, or the obligations of the United States to its allies, on the basis of some action taken today or some action taken yesterday. The United States has already made its program clear so far as an international organization is concerned. We shall have all the troops which it will be necessary for us to have. They will be strong regardless of anything that may be done so far as satisfying the demands of the world in meeting our obligations to the United Nations Organization is concerned. There were only two persons who were foolish enough to announce to the world that democracy was weak. Those two persons are now dead. The name of one of them was Mussolini and the name of the other was Hitler. No one will judge the strength of the United States and its ability to create great armies in order to carry into effect its program, on the basis of whether we are short 1,000 troops in accordance with a certain quota. Our obligations will be lived up to. Everyone in the world knows that they will be lived up to because America has not often failed in her promises. The Army of the United States is today very strong. Its potential strength is very much greater. There is no desire on the part of anyone that we shall maintain an Army of 8,000,000 men such as we had during the war. That Army, great and glorious as it was, Mr. President, did not in any sense represent what is called the full strength of the United States. We base our strength upon our morals, upon our history, upon our determination, and upon the will of our people, quite as much as upon any other factors.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I believed it to be necessary to make the statement which I have made. If somebody unwisely assumes that we are taking a backward step, that person will be very badly disappointed.

I believe the discussion is now over, and I should like to have the question put to a vote of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator's remarks. I was not present in the Chamber when the session began. The Senator from Utah and other Senators have spoken about the strength of the Army. I should like some information. How does the pending measure affect the so-called strength of the Navy so far as its volunteers are concerned.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe that, in theory and in fact, the Navy will not be affected. The Navy stated, through its representatives, that volunteers are

coming into the Navy because, primarily, the draft act is in existence. However, that is one of the unknowns. Personally I believe that service in the United States Army and in the United States Navy will continue to be very attractive to many of the thoughtful youth of our Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Insofar as the information known to the Senator is concerned, voluntary enlistments in the Navy have been holding up very well, have they not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Navy has been receiving enlistments during the past few months at a monthly average rate of 13,000. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has some figures with regard to the situation. I believe that 13,000 a month is the Navy's quota.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I will quote from General Hershey, who referred correctly to the position of the Navy. I know that his reference was a correct one because I also listened to Secretary Forrester on the same subject. I read:

The Navy Department estimates 328,000 of that number—

That is, of 384,000—

will be under contract September 1, provided the current rate of enlistments continues. Assuming an additional attrition of 13,000 enlisted personnel through August, the Navy Department will require 185,000 enlistments from civilian life by September 21, or 27,000 monthly in order to meet a postwar strength of 500,000. The Navy believes that their 2- and 3-year contracts will offer sufficient inducements for voluntary enlistments, and that its goal will be reached by September 1. Inasmuch as the enlistments from civilian life are almost entirely made either from persons who are liable or who are about to become liable for military service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act, I am of the opinion that termination of the act will seriously affect their recruiting program.

That was the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may we have a vote?

Mr. LANGER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. May we have a vote on my motion?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I wonder if I may have the floor in order to speak in opposition to the position taken by the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what is now the parliamentary situation? Are we about to vote on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor of the motion—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has no right to occupy the floor until the vote has been taken on the motion. The Senator from North Dakota has been waiting for the Senator from Utah to sit down, but he refuses to sit down until a vote is taken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Ohio is indulging in some of those great un-

knowns about which I have spoken. If he has any reason for saying that the Senator from Utah intends to do this or that, and is sure of what he says, I shall be glad to have him say so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not make a point of order during the discussion which has been held, but the discussion was subject to a point of order at any time because the Senator from Utah was occupying the floor, farming it out to various Senators, and then concluding by making a speech. I do not believe that is the proper way to proceed under the rules of the Senate. I did not raise an objection, but I do not think the procedure was correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah still has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator from Ohio should be informed that the Senator from Utah obtained the floor by asking the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to yield for a certain purpose. Until that purpose is accomplished I believe that the Senator from Utah has the right to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah may hold the floor, but not to the exclusion of some other Senator who wishes to speak on the same subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has never attempted to do that. The Senator from North Dakota asked to be recognized. Because of the papers which the Senator from North Dakota was holding in his hands, I assumed that he wished to speak upon another subject. Therefore, I asked the Senator from North Dakota—and if there is anything discourteous in this I should like to have the Senator from Ohio point it out—if he would not be willing to wait until the Chair put the question before the Senate, and then ask me to yield to him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from North Dakota informed us later that he wanted to speak on the pending motion. If the Senator from North Dakota desires to speak on the motion, I shall be glad to have him do so, but the Chair should remember that I asked for two specific things when I took the floor. When the motion shall be carried one of them will have been accomplished, and I asked the Senator from North Dakota if I might not accomplish the other one, too. I do not think there has been any discourtesy. I do not think there has been any need for what has been said about the action of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, perhaps I could be helpful to the Senator from North Dakota. I think the RECORD will show that the junior Senator from Florida had the floor and that he yielded it to permit the disposition of the business which was to be presented to the Senate by the able Senator from Utah.

If the Senator from North Dakota was fearful that if he did not at the present time obtain leave to speak to the Senate because of the fact that the junior Senator from Florida had the floor, I shall be glad to assure him I shall gladly yield to him as soon as this matter is disposed

of. I should not like to lose the floor, but I should be glad to yield to the Senator for as long as he would like.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to speak on the pending business, and I have a right to do so, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As I understand, the pending business has been temporarily laid aside so that the privileged business can be considered. Does the Senator wish to speak in regard to the motion that has been made as a privileged matter?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the business that has been made a privileged matter, and which has been discussed by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is entitled to speak on the motion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rose to take a position opposite to that expressed by the distinguished Senator from Utah. I desire to speak at some length, and I request that I not be interrupted until I have concluded. Then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

First of all, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on the 7th of May last entitled "Million Volunteers Forecast for Army, Setting a Record." I read from the article:

The United States will have a regular standing Army of 1,000,000 volunteers by the end of June, Maj. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, chief of Army personnel procurement, predicted today.

At the same time, General Gilbert warned the Nation cannot maintain a regular peacetime volunteer Army until the War Department can compete for manpower on equal footing with private industry. He said it would be necessary to continue selective service "indefinitely"—perhaps for 3 years.

In 7 months, General Gilbert reported, the Army has recruited 737,144 men—"the largest Army of volunteers ever maintained by any country at any time.

Imagine that, Mr. President—never before in the history of the world has any country had a larger army of volunteers at any time than we have at the present time.

In November, more than 189,000 enlisted. Since October, the Army has obtained an average of 105,000 new soldiers each month.

May and June are expected to produce between 250,000 and 300,000 new men, drawn largely from high school graduating classes. General Gilbert said surveys indicate at least 25 percent of senior class boys plan to enlist this summer. There is reason to hope, he said, that 17- to 18-year-old enlistments will "run even higher," particularly if Congress approves a pay raise bill now pending.

Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I wish to say, first of all, that the youth of this country, the GI's, the veterans, have had no better friend upon this floor than the senior Senator from North Dakota. How well I remember when I rose shortly after the war broke out and asked that the pay of a buck private be made \$100 a month. It is significant that I was sustained in my argument by Senator Bennett Clark, now a distinguished Federal judge, at that time a Senator from the State of

Missouri, a man who at one time was the national commander of the American Legion. Senator Clark at that time said that \$100 a month, instead of \$50 for a buck private in his opinion was right, and just, and proper, and fair.

Instead of my suggestion being followed, we had the spectacle here in the United States of two brothers, both eligible for service, one of them going into the Army at \$50 a month, while when President Roosevelt asked the Senate that the amount of salary the other brother could receive could be limited to \$67,200, or a net of \$25,000, the suggestion was turned down by the Congress of the United States. I believe I was the only Republican voting for it at that time, although there may have been one more. I recall today the fact that from the beginning the senior Senator from North Dakota did everything in his power to get the buck private decent pay, \$100 a month.

Mr. President, it is significant that a few months ago one of General MacArthur's right-hand men came back from the South Pacific, a distinguished gentleman, a man who three times had been Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, Mr. Philip La Follette. Mr. Philip La Follette appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and said, basing his answers upon the experience he had had, that he believed the men who volunteered should now receive \$100 a month, that that would do more to cause young men voluntarily to enlist than anything else that could be done.

Mr. President, what was the strength of the Army on May 1 of this year? Exclusive of officers on terminal leave, the Army's strength was 2,100,000 men and women. The Army's strength goal for July 1, 1946, is 1,550,000 men and women, so there is a surplus today of 550,000 men and women.

I have here an analysis of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1946, page 3258:

Approximate enlistments by July 1,	
1946.....	900,000
Philippine Scouts.....	50,000
Men not in service a year.....	226,000
Draftees not in a year.....	400,000
Total.....	1,726,000
Army strength goal on July 1, 1946.....	1,500,000
Estimated surplus (as estimated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who is a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs).....	
Estimated surplus July 1, 1946 (according to prediction of Major General Gilbert, Chief of the Army Procurement that there will be an increase of a million by July 1, 1946).....	226,000
	326,000

Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed this matter rather fully over the radio, on a national hook-up. I said at that time:

We won the war. But we are losing the peace. We are losing the peace because we are doing all kinds of double-talk about supporting the United Nations to restore and keep world order and at the same time calling for vast armed might of our own by which to threaten the rest of the world. We are losing the peace because we are telling

ourselves that everybody trusts us and believes in our peaceful intentions while announcing to the world by our actions that we are not going to trust anybody. We are losing the peace because we are trying to substitute power politics supported by B-29's and atomic bombs for constructive statesmanship. We are losing the peace because we keep asserting that the war is not over and that we must maintain further into peacetime all our war-inspired restrictions and regimentations, including military conscription.

Mr. President, as I view it, the war ended more than a year ago. We have been proud here in America that the only time we have ever conscripted men has been in wartime; that we have never done so in peacetime. Personally I am entirely and unequivocally and absolutely and completely opposed to conscripting men and women in peacetime. Anyone who has read history knows very well how in Europe this insidious method of conscription began and has grown and grown until today it is a festering sore upon the political life of Europe.

Conscription starts generally on a small scale; it is instituted for a few months, and a little later it is extended for a year, and then some time later conscription is extended for 2 years, and later it is made to cover a period of 3 years. Then conscription is fastened forever upon the people of a country.

Mr. President, some of the very best citizens of America have come to our shores in order to escape 1, 2, 3 and 4 years of universal military conscription which was in effect in their fatherland or in their motherland. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to have military conscription in peacetime fastened on the people of the United States of America if I can help it.

I repeat what I stated in my broadcast:

The war is over. The sooner we recognize that fact and set ourselves to rebuild democracy and justice at home and help inspire and maintain them abroad, the better promise we will have of winning the peace. This false alarm, "The war is not over" is being used by Secretary Patterson and General Eisenhower as official spokesmen for the War Department to foist upon America military conscription in peacetime. After having failed to pressure Congress and the American people into the acceptance of peacetime conscription for military training, they now come before us and declare that the war is not over.

That this effort to extend selective service now is part of a long-range plan to fasten conscription on America as a permanent policy is quite clear when one puts all the pieces of the puzzle together. Even before the war had ended powerful forces in the Government had launched a drive to get a universal military training law on the books. When the religious and educational forces of the Nation, the laborers and the farmers, and many of its wisest statesmen repudiated this move, the War Department went before the Committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely.

Mr. President, when the religious and educational forces of the Nation, when the representatives of churches, when a great many of the presidents and professors of our colleges in America filed petition after petition protesting to Congress against universal military conscrip-

tion in peacetime, when laborers and farmers, and many of our wisest statesmen repudiated this method, the War Department went before the committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely.

If it had not been for the great work done by the religious leaders in America, if it had not been for the magnificent fight put up by the presidents of a great many of our universities, we would long ago have carried out the wishes of members of the War Department who appeared before the various committees. It was only because of the magnificent fight of the religious leaders and of the educational leaders and of leading farmers and businessmen that this has not been done up to the present time. When these religious leaders, educators, farmers, and businessmen were assured that the Congress would not write the War Department this blank check, then the War Department agreed—to what? To take a 1-year extension—the very thing the Department originally said it could not do—but it required that conscription be applied to all citizens from 18 years to 45 years of age. This just shows what public opinion, led by the religious forces and the educational forces of America, succeeded in getting the Army to do when they mustered their forces and came before the proper committees of this great body.

Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia—

And that is what they wanted these boys for originally; they wanted 18- and 19-year-old boys to be used as police in Europe and Asia. They wanted to take them out of school and make policemen out of them.

Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia, the Secretary of War now states for publication that if Congress will let them keep drafting these youths they won't send them abroad. First they tell us they can't get along without these boys and keep the necessary forces overseas. And then the Secretary of War tells us they don't need them for foreign-occupation troops at all. They will just keep them at home—in the Army, of course. Well, I say let's keep them at home—on the farms and in the factories, in school and college, and give them a chance to become decent and useful American citizens.

Let them stay at home with their parents instead of taking them into camps away from the fine home influences of which we Americans are so proud.

Two months ago I introduced a bill in the Senate to declare that the war is terminated so far as war legislation is concerned. I had already introduced a bill last September to stop the involuntary induction of men into land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act. I introduced these bills in the confident belief that we are impeding the recovery of our liberties at home and the reestablishment of freedom elsewhere by the hypocritical pretense that we are still at war. To be sure, we do have great problems before us. But we shall not settle them by maintaining wartime controls and a wartime military draft.

Mr. President, I have here a letter which I received from my home State of North Dakota, from the Young Men's Christian Association, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., which is the second largest city in our State.

Senator LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing as one of your constituents—

This letter is written to me by the general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., a man who deals with the very finest in life.

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription.

I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war—

Here is a young man, Leonard H. Engstrom, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, who served as an enlisted man through five campaigns during the recent war. He continues:

and I feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription.

I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, as expressed in his radio address over Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, April 20.

I will be watching with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

Yours very truly,
LEONARD H. ENGSTROM,
General Secretary.

Continuing with my radio address, I said at that time:

Again we are told by these advocates from the Pentagon Building that we must have a continuation of the draft in order to meet our foreign commitments. Now just what commitments are these gentlemen talking about? There are insinuations that our signature to the Charter of the United Nations has obligated us to occupy the rest of the world, to maintain armed garrisons all around the globe. We have agreed to help occupy Japan and Korea and Germany. But why do we need troops in Iceland and Egypt and Canada and China and some 50 other parts of the world?

Why should the fine young men of this country who want to make a success in life, who want to serve apprenticeships in various businesses, who want to go to college and get an education—young men who want to get married and establish their own homes and have their own families—be sent to Iceland, Egypt, Korea, and China, and 50 other parts of the world?

Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not take as serious view of this question as perhaps some of my colleagues do, because I remember so well, only a few days ago, when the distinguished majority leader in this body stated that it was more important that we give away \$3,750,000,000 than to consider the question of universal military training. The British loan was far more important than the discussion of

universal military training. Every Senator who was present at that time will remember that statement by the distinguished majority leader. It was far more important to make the loan to Great Britain; and he stated that if the loan to Great Britain were not out of the way by the 15th of May it would be just too bad that we would have no draft law, but that we would get along in some way or other. He stated that we had to pass the loan to Great Britain first. So I really do not see very much to worry about today, when giving away \$3,750,000,000 of our money to the British was more important, so the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky said, than having the draft law passed by the 15th day of May.

To repeat:

Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

He now says that they need these troops, not to occupy Korea, China, Iceland, or any other country, but to guard surplus property—trucks, jeeps, and what not.

What a travesty on common sense and honesty, that we are being cajoled and frightened and threatened into extension of conscription to provide men who can watch our tractors rust away on Pacific islands, to stand guard over beer going stale, 500,000 cases of it in Guam alone, according to Time magazine, to keep naked natives in India from taking blankets that will be burned in the end anyway.

We take our boys out of school and send them over to Guam to stand guard over half a million cases of beer, according to Time magazine.

Why do we keep these surplus supplies all over the world at enormous expense? Is it in order to make a case for an army to guard them? And how much longer are we going to permit this thing?

Now here is another picture for intelligent Americans: We are asked to maintain troops in Germany. And recently in Paris Secretary Byrnes proposed a treaty to bind us to continue occupation of Germany for a quarter of a century. One of the reasons why this is regarded as necessary is to put down disorder among a people that are actually starving to death. Yet we are asked to keep on conscripting men to guard supplies much of which could be used to create the food and clothing and other necessities to relieve this need. But because we have no statesmanship adequate for this, we are further asked to conscript men to stand ready to shoot down hungry Germans who may grow too impatient with our blundering.

That is along the line of what was said today by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

If we want to talk seriously about our commitments to create world order, to establish democracy and to preserve peace, we must abandon this illusion of peace by threat, of democracy by compulsion, and of order by deploying military power all over the globe. In place of these purely negative and repressive measures we must turn to positive and constructive ones.

Let us look a little further at the case of the War Department for extension of the draft beyond its expiration date of May 15. We must not gamble with national security, we are told.

They say, "Do not gamble with national security. Do not take that responsibility."

But it is not our national security that is in danger. We have and are able to maintain by voluntary enlistment a Navy bigger and more powerful than all the rest of the navies of the world. We have air forces, well equipped and well based, which excel the air power of any other nation and are more powerful than all the others combined. We can maintain these forces without further drafting men for their ranks. And we alone possess the atomic bomb, which dwarfs all the military power of the rest of the world. For the first time in the history of the world, one nation—ourselves—could annihilate the military establishments and the centers of population of the rest of the world. If it is defense that we seek, there has never been a nation more secure from defeat than the United States is today.

But the suspicion grows here—as it certainly has already grown abroad—

It grows in Washington; it grows in Oklahoma; it grows in North Dakota; it grows in Michigan; it grows in Ohio; it grows in Maine. The suspicion grows all over the United States—

that it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the suspicion to which I have referred has grown not only here in Washington but all over the United States. That suspicion is, as I said in my radio speech—

That it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime, for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples. And even if we blasted the rest of the world to ruins, we would still have to have ground forces to retain control over the ruins. In short, the kind of overwhelming military and naval power we possess is really not sufficient to establish nor maintain empires. For this a nation must have armed garrisons. Are we being asked to stand ready to stand guard over the remnants of Britain's disintegrating empire? Or are we getting ready to launch an empire-building program of our own? Are we getting ready to pull British chestnuts out of the Near East fire where Russia is bidding for the oil of Iran and Iraq and Arabia by the very same methods that have given Britain a practical monopoly over the oil of these countries? Are we ready to guarantee that the Mediterranean is to remain a British lake, denying to Russia at the Dardanelles what we are protecting for Britain at Gibraltar and Suez? Must we conscript our boys—

And, Mr. President, in some instances that means boys who already have served in our armed forces, boys who already have gone to Europe and have served 1 year or 2 years. Must we conscript them, as I said in my speech over the radio—

to keep British troops in Indonesia and India where they shoot down the colonists for seeking the freedom we fought Britain for a century and three-quarters ago?

Reduced to its final analysis, extension of the draft—

As I view it—

is demanded as a countermeasure against fear of Russia.

Mr. President, I am one Senator who believes that this country never again should go to war. I am one Senator who believes in everlasting peace. I am the one Senator who upon this floor pointed out to every other Senator, at the time when the United Nations Charter was about to be voted for by the Senate, that those who spoke in favor of it—and I particularly mentioned the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, after he had said that the United Nations Charter we were about to vote for was similar to the Constitution of the United States—I, and I alone, on this floor, Mr. President, pointed out that, under our Constitution, when the Thirteen Colonies joined together, neither Vermont nor New York nor any other State had the power of veto over any of the other of the 13 Colonies. I pointed out that the veto power provided by the Charter of the United Nations was going to cause a great deal of trouble. I pointed out that in my opinion the Charter of the United Nations could not work, if one country had the veto power over all the actions of the other countries who signed the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, it is indeed remarkable that within a comparatively few weeks after the United States signed the United Nations Charter, we find that in the newspapers for the past Sunday there appeared an article by the Secretary of the United Nations—and it appeared in newspapers all over America and, no doubt, all over the world—in which he said that in his opinion the United Nations Charter could not succeed unless the veto power were eliminated. However, there is no provision in the United Nations Charter for removing the veto power. There is no provision for amending the United Nations Charter, unless it is done by unanimous consent of every one of the countries who signed it.

Yet the American delegation and the British delegation at San Francisco put up no battle to get rid of the veto power, at the time when the United Nations Charter was being drafted. Nay, Mr. President, to the contrary, when one of the distinguished delegates to the San Francisco Conference—the representative of Australia—fought to have the small powers placed on a basis of equality with the larger powers, under the United Nations Charter, when the representative of Australia fought for the same thing that the smallest, tiniest colony of the Thirteen Colonies in America fought for at the time when our Constitution was being drawn up and adopted, the United States and England said, "No." Mr. President, when history is finally written the greatest statesmen among all the men who appeared at San Francisco will be found to be that brilliant statesman from Australia.

What are the important facts, figures, and testimony pertaining to the matter of draft extension? Let me say that I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

SHIPSTEAD) is now in the Chamber, because in his speeches in the past he has time and time again verified the figures I shall cite. As I was about to say, the important facts and figures and testimony show that the Army can have more than 1,550,000 men by July 1 without the draft. If we pay enough for service in our armed forces, a sufficient number of young men will enter them. The very figures I have read prove that. But instead of giving the poor GI's who were drafted more than \$50 a month—just think of it, Mr. President, \$50—their brothers who did not go into the armed forces were permitted to make as much as they possibly could make. When an effort was made to limit salaries in the United States, Congress would not even pass the proposed measure, and Congress said to those who were not drafted, "Go ahead and make all you possibly can make." During the war there was a proposal that salaries be limited to \$25,000 net, but the Congress refused to pass such a measure. It was proposed that salaries in the United States be limited to a gross amount of approximately \$67,200, which would leave a net amount of not more than \$25,000 after the payment of income taxes. But the Congress refused to enact such a measure. Oh, yes, Mr. President; the Congress showed what it thought of the sacrifices the GI's were making. In fact, one man in California, at the very time when the GI's were risking their lives in the fox holes, made approximately a million and a half dollars. It was said that he would lose much of it by way of payments to the Government under the income-tax law. It is significant that last year the Federal Government paid more than a billion dollars in income-tax refunds. The GI's will be glad to know that a man like the one I have just mentioned could even have, as a hobby—this man who made a million and a half dollars—the maintenance of a race track. If he wished to do so, he could pay \$50,000 for a race horse and could race it—as a hobby—and could deduct that amount from his income tax, as an expense. That was the case at the very time when, upon this floor, it was alleged that Marshall Field was running various newspapers as a hobby, and that he could make income-tax deductions for the expenses of operating his newspapers—in short, that he could do as other men had done for a long time, and that it was perfectly legal to do so. Mr. President, I wonder what the GI's who were sacrificing their all thought about a Congress which refused to limit to a net of \$25,000 a year the amount of money a man or a woman in the United States could make in salary alone, and when the Congress said, "That is too little; go ahead and make all you possibly can make."

Another important fact is that those who make the estimates of the number of volunteers do not consider the matter of pay increases. Mr. President, how can it be said that voluntary enlistments will decrease in May and June and July and August? As a matter of fact, they may increase.

The other House has already voted for pay increases. If the Senate votes to concur in the House action, and the pay is increased, thousands of boys may enlist who would not enlist under the present rate of compensation. So it is idle to say, as it was said by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that we will not receive a sufficient number of voluntary enlistments.

One of the most important questions is, Are enlistments being retarded by raising the point system? I assert, Mr. President, that so many contradictory statements have been issued by the representatives of the War Department, and so much confusion exists with regard to the issues of military compulsion, that we must reanalyze the problem in its broader significance if we propose to solve it in a logical and rational manner. There is only one justification for approving the War Department's program of extending the draft act now, with its related recommendations, which would inflict a military system or a caste system upon the United States. I refer to national security. I repeat the statement. The only excuse for universal military training is the possibility of our national security being in danger. If we believe our security will be jeopardized by failure to accept the Army's recommendations, we must, however reluctantly, agree to the program in spite of its obvious dangers.

Mr. President, how often have we seen Senator after Senator arise in his place and say that he, though reluctantly, would vote for the bill to extend the draft act even though it did not meet with his approval? I maintain that no Senator should vote reluctantly for anything. I do not propose to vote reluctantly for anything. A thing is either right or it is wrong. If it is right, we should vote for it. If it is wrong, we should vote against it. To me, it does not make any sense to hear, as we heard today, a Senator say that he does not agree with the proposal before the Senate, but that he will vote reluctantly for it. I assert, in all sincerity and with full knowledge of the importance of the present issue to the people of the United States, that the Army's program for controlling the manpower of the Nation has no bearing on the security of the United States. If we do not extend the draft beyond May 15, we will be just as secure on May 16 as we are today. It is of vital importance that Congress, as well as the American people, understand that situation. Mr. President, allow me to explain.

If we will analyze the military policy of the United States, and the program of the Army under such policy, we will be compelled to admit that the Army has not been too brilliant in its approach to the problem of national security. If any disinterested person had sat in the conference of the Civil Service Committee the other day—we have now had about 13 or 14 meetings—and had heard the reports which were made by representatives of the Army, he would have agreed with the statement which was made that it was not possible to tell within 25 percent how many persons would be required

by the Army during the next quarter. So I say that if we will analyze the military policy of the United States, and the program of the Army under that policy, we will have to admit that the Army has not been too brilliant in its approach to the problem of national security.

We have accused the Japanese of being copyists, and of not being able to originate any new ideas. I wonder if our Army has done much better? For generations our military leaders copied certain techniques of the Germans. No other country has had such influence on our Army leadership. Our officers attended German military schools. Some of them proudly commended the German panzer divisions during their maneuvers just before the outbreak of World War II. A great deal of the pattern of our uniforms, as well as much of our military discipline has been copied from the Germans. Our Army leaders studied German strategy and tactics which were considered superior to those of any other nation in the world. The military attaché of Germany was a welcome visitor at the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff and the G-2 office of our Army until the very moment of the German invasion of Belgium and France. Our military officers and our G-2 office, in their estimate of the military situation just before the German invasion, stated that Germany would not invade Belgium. The prediction was based upon the personal word of the German military attaché given to one of the subordinates in the G-2 office. Now, after the militarism of Germany, Italy, and Japan has been defeated and discarded during the terrible war, our Army goes off the deep end for militarism and aspires to becoming the leader in this new world.

The Army has consistently condemned the American people for their lack of preparedness during peacetime. I suggest that the Army look at the mote in its own eye before trying to cast out the beam in the eyes of our citizens.

Mr. President, we came out of World War I as the inheritor of the new revolutionary weapon, air power—a weapon as revolutionary in its way as the atomic bomb is now. We trained a nucleus of air force during World War I. We had every asset necessary to develop a new kind of military force, and to lead the world. At our colleges we had the finest body of young men of any country in the world. They would have taken to flying like ducks to water. We had an unlimited number of mechanics who could service airplanes. Nearly every boy knew how to drive a car and how to keep the motor in operation. We had an unlimited supply of gasoline for training purposes. Most countries of the world lacked an equal supply. In Gen. Billy Mitchell and his assistants we had inspired leaders who had a vision of the potentiality of air power. We had scientists who designed planes. We had a national industry capable of producing planes in unlimited numbers, just as we produced them later, but much too late. With all those assets we might, with the proper Army leadership, have developed the finest air power in the world. We

could have built a fighting air force ready for instant action, an air power which neither Germany nor any other nation in the world would have dared to challenge.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a very brief statement?

Mr. LANGER. I yield with the understanding that I will have the floor at the conclusion of the Senator's statement.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from North Dakota to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, yesterday I reached an arrangement with the majority leader and those in charge of the labor bill to the effect that a recess would be taken at 3 o'clock this afternoon in order to permit the minority Members of the Senate to hold a conference on matters which they deemed to be of importance. In view of the situation which has developed, and in view of the great desire of at least most of the Members of the Senate to dispose of the pending motion, either affirmatively or by rejection, I have released the majority side from any obligations which may have existed with respect to the recess.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what did the Army do with this potential power? It liquidated General Mitchell, and hamstrung his entire program. It shackled air power to the foot soldier, and placed its development at the whims of the foot soldier. It circumscribed instruction in air power in our service schools. It taught all the techniques of World War I all over again, when it should have had the vision to realize that another world war could not follow the pattern of the first. It spent as much money buying forage for horse cavalry in the National Guard, to permit officers to play polo and their wives to ride horseback without cost, as it did on air power in the National Guard.

I wish to repeat that. This Army which is now criticizing the Congress spent as much money buying forage for horse cavalry in the National Guard to permit officers to play polo and their wives to ride horseback without cost as it did on air power of the National Guard.

Just a few weeks ago, after a long generation of waste, it finally abolished the horse cavalry. While we neglected air power, Germany saw the potentialities of new weapons, used the techniques which we had rejected, and almost defeated us in World War II with our own weapons. So the Army, and not the people of the United States, fumbled our national security, and with almost fatal results. We may ask ourselves how many men had to die to pay for that blunder.

Now we come out of World War II with another revolutionary weapon, the atomic bomb. It is more revolutionary than air power. Every principle of military science which had previously been accepted became obsolete or suspect

when the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima.

Has the Army profited by that lesson? Not at all. It sends its representatives before the Military Affairs Committees of Congress—and I have the record, Mr. President, right here in my hand—to advocate a program of compulsory military training, and an extension of the draft, in order to man armies which are as obsolete as the bow and arrow. Even the children in the street have ceased playing "cops and robbers" in their war games, and have turned to atomic weapons. But the Army has not learned that lesson. It still speaks of bayonet training, and the .30 caliber rifle, and urges that training facilities for these weapons be not neglected. It takes proud credit for having, one generation too late, abolished the horse cavalry, and points to the fact that it has kept up to date by turning to tanks instead, but it is completely oblivious of the fact that the tank is as obsolete today as horse cavalry was after World War I. It proposes that we must drag the obsolete paraphernalia of mass armies along with us, as a ship drags its barnacles, until it finally awakens to the fact that these weapons, too, are obsolete.

These Army advocates state that we must have an army in being and immediately available, and conclude that this can be accomplished only with compulsory training and the draft. Obviously, the next war will not be fought with these weapons. We are all intelligent enough to realize that World War III, if it comes, will not follow the pattern of any other war. It will be fought with the atomic bomb, or with other new weapons of terror which are unknown at the present time—death rays, or death germs, or super V-bombs. It will be a short, sudden, devastating war. If we have not the time to train mass armies after war commences, as the Army rightly contends, neither will we have time to mobilize mass armies, or to retrain them in new techniques, or to transport them to any place in the world. The armies which our high command proposes to train have already been bypassed by the new weapons, just as Japanese foot soldiers were bypassed in China without having had an opportunity of firing a shot. We are still trying to transport those Japanese back to Japan.

The rigidity of the Army thinking on the problem of national security is as dangerous as the Maginot Line complex was to France. If we adopt its policy of basing national security on mass armies, we will pay stupendous sums to maintain obsolete forces, and will be purchasing a delusion of national security, instead of real security.

We do worse than that. We waste the youth of the United States. At the present time the Army has scraped the bottom of the barrel in selecting men for military service, and all that remain are the 18- and 19-year-old boys. These boys have no military value. They are totally unsuitable, because they are too immature, to be used as occupational troops. They are unsuitable for use in a technical army, as our new Army must be, because they have developed no techniques.

We found during World War II that the more mature men were most valuable for our technical army, because they had developed techniques in college or in industry to fit them for their technical duties. If we now siphon off our young, immature boys, we will defeat our own purpose, and make them less valuable, potentially, for military service than if we left them in college or industry until they had developed the necessary techniques. The Army has no machinery for developing such techniques, as we discovered during the war, when our young men, drafted into the military service, were sent to schools and colleges at Government expense to acquire the techniques which the Army was unprepared to give them.

Obviously, if there is another war it will be fought with new weapons and new techniques, which demand a minimum of manpower. We do not know at the present time how large an Army we would require, if it were built around the new weapons. The Army has no right to come before Congress and demand a blank check on our manpower until it has thought its way through the problem, and is prepared to give us some conclusive estimates.

In this connection I might say, speaking about 18- and 19-year-old boys and about selective service, this is what General Eisenhower testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on April 8:

There is no one that I know of, either in or out of the Army, that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers could he get all the volunteers.

That was General Eisenhower speaking, and I say that if we should raise the pay of the buck privates to such a point that they would receive the amount of money they should have gotten when the war broke out, we would have so many volunteers the Army could not use them all.

It has been stated that General MacArthur estimated that an army of 100,000 men, armed with the new weapons, would be sufficient. We do not know for certain what his estimate of the number is. We can take it for granted, however, that if General MacArthur were in favor of this system of military compulsion he would have been summoned by the War Department to appear before the committees of both Houses to state his views, or his views would at least have been obtained for the record. The very fact that General MacArthur was not summoned, that he did not give his testimony, is to me very significant, as I believe it must be to all the GIs everywhere in the United States of America.

Mr. President, it is not unreasonable to suppose that an army of two or three hundred thousand men would be sufficient. A tremendous number of atomic bombs can be carried and dumped by an air force of 400,000 men, which the Army proposes. Or perhaps we should have a small corps of saboteurs instead of men in uniform, because we may reasonably expect that the next war will be conducted largely by saboteurs.

The Army convicts itself of confused thinking in its own calculations of the number of men which it can obtain by voluntary enlistment even for the vast armies to which it has foolishly committed itself. When all of the shouting and the tumult dies we find, much to our surprise, that all the arguments revolve about a possible deficit or shortage of 70,000 men, based on a total estimated strength of 1,070,000 men as of July 1, 1947. It is a strange commentary on the Army General Staff calculations that civilians without any special background of military training were in the Senate committee hearings able to take the Army's own figures and show that the Army had omitted 50,000 Philippine Scouts and thousands of men drafted between January 1 and May 15, 1946, who will still be in service in 1947, 18 months later. Civilians and not the Army dug that fact out and presented it before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs during the hearings.

If Army figures are to be trusted it will have all the men it requires by that date. If it has not it can obtain them by other means within its own capabilities without calling for an extension of the draft. It can, for example, eliminate the caste system. Let it get rid of the caste system which the GI's hate and which has no place in the American Army. We cannot get rid of it too soon. Let the Army get rid of the caste system. Let the Army raise the pay and thus induce more general volunteering. I know the feelings of the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. I listened to the magnificent radio speech he delivered in April of this year. I know that the Army of the United States would profit if it would call into consultation the distinguished Senator from the State of Idaho and listen to some of his splendid suggestions.

So I say, Mr. President, that if the Army wants to get more young men to volunteer let it get rid of the caste system. Let it give the GI the same terminal leave that it gives to the officer. Let it treat the GI more like a human being, and the Army will get all the volunteers it needs, and more, because, as I said before, all these arguments revolve about a possible deficit or shortage of 70,000 men.

The Army can bring back our soldiers stationed in countries which we do not need to occupy. There are fifty-some such countries, as I said a little while ago. What business have our soldiers in Iceland or in Korea or in some other country I mentioned earlier in my speech?

In addition to this, the Army can speed up the disposition of surplus property which our men are now guarding all over the world, or dump it in the ocean, since much of it will have so deteriorated in the Tropics as to be absolutely useless, indeed, most of it, so far as another war is concerned.

Mr. President, we have one hundred and some billion dollars' worth of surplus property. Until a few days ago the veteran did not even get enough of surplus property to wa^d a shotgun. The farmer did not get any of it. Every

Senator on this floor knows that in the last 15 months or so we have had four different organizations handling surplus property, and that the thing was almost a hopeless mess. Besides that, as newspapers have stated, much of the surplus property was sold anyhow. We loaned Italy money to buy some of the surplus property. Italy bought much of it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Army can employ civilian guards both at home as well as in foreign countries to guard such property. Why should the Army draft a young lad 18 or 19 or 20 or a man 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 years of age and take him away from his wife and children, take him out of school, take him out of college, and send him over to Iceland or Korea or some other country to guard surplus property; to guard, for example, half a million cases of beer in Guam? I am in favor of pouring the beer out and letting those men come home. Or the Army can give away the beer or sell it if the Army wants to, or do anything it wants to with it so far as I am concerned. I do not want to be one Senator who votes to take our young boys from the United States and send them over to Guam to guard half a million cases of beer, or to guard whisky, or anything else along that line that the Army has over there. If the Army wants to guard that stuff, let the Army hire civilians and pay them enough to do it, instead of taking young boys into the Army to do such work.

In addition to that, our Army can get men from other countries where this stuff is located to do the guard duty. The Army does not have to take young men from America and send them to Iceland, for example, to guard anything over there. Mr. President, in my State of North Dakota there are two counties in which the majority of the people are of Icelandic extraction. We have had men of Icelandic extraction as chief justices of our Supreme Court. We have had them in the office of the attorney general. They have occupied the highest position of trust in the State. The people who came from Iceland have made splendid citizens, and I am perfectly willing to have the United States Army hire all the Icelandic boys they think necessary, or that they want to hire, and pay them well to guard beer or trucks or jeeps or anything else in Iceland or any other country rather than to take these 17-, 18-, 19-, 20-, 21-, 22-, 23-, 24-, 25-, or 26-year-old boys. Our Army can require the foreign countries to furnish the guards. Our Army can develop a military constabulary on a voluntary basis for guard and occupational duties. Primarily it can set its own house in order and make Army service such a desirable occupation that our men will be glad to enter the Army as a career. There is no reason why young men should not choose the Army as a career if we but pay them enough, if we give them the same terminal leave as officers are given, if we abolish the caste system and do away with the abominable distinction that now exists between GI's and officers.

Mr. President, I say it is a tragic commentary on our military system that with a million and a half trained soldiers presently unemployed, another

one-half million taking training who will soon be looking for employment, and another million still to be discharged, the Army cannot induce a sufficient number of men to enlist notwithstanding it offers the largest labor outlet in the United States today. I say, Mr. President—and I believe the overwhelming number of GI's will agree with me—that something is definitely wrong with the Army, and it is about time that the Congress made it its business to find out what the trouble is.

Since mass armies cannot be used for a foreign war, and since the atomic bomb cannot be used on the home front, is it not reasonable to assume that one reason for continuing mass armies is their potential value at home? During the depression the Army leadership was concerned with the military problem of putting down domestic insurrection. This situation arose because our leadership had failed at home and we were preparing to solve economic problems by military force, just as we try to solve international problems with military force. Whenever we find ourselves down an intellectual blind alley and cannot think our way out, we reach for our guns and try to shoot our way out, and often we end up by blowing out our own brains.

Does the Army have in mind a program of placing guns in the hands of our 18-year-old boys to suppress the veterans of this war, just as it planned to suppress the veterans of World War I who were selling apples on street corners even here in the city of Washington? Soldier boys were employed to shoot at the men who had offered their lives in defense of our country. I ask again, does the Army have in mind today the program of placing guns in the hands of our 18-year-old boys to suppress the veterans of this war, just as it planned to suppress the veterans of World War I who were selling apples on street corners? If we are realistic we will face this issue openly and not try to cover it up. Let the Army present an answer.

The point has been made that we require a large army as an instrument of power politics. If we actually intend to engage in power politics, backed up by military force, what value is possessed by large immobile, clumsy armies as instruments of foreign policy? If we commit ourselves to the same kind of army we have used in the past, we shall serve notice on every other country in the world that it will take us from 2 to 3 years to get ready for combat in the event of another war.

Too many officers in the Army are clamoring for war with Russia. I have talked with Army officer after Army officer who wants war with Russia. Let us remind them, if they cannot see the military situation themselves, that the United States cannot train and transport to Russia enough men organized into mass armies to defeat Russia on her home soil. At least, if we did it would be tremendously costly in human life. In my judgment we should likely be defeated, just as Napoleon and Hitler were defeated. Perhaps not. I am only a civilian. I am not one of the brass hats. Perhaps they have some system or plan worked out, about which the average

Senator or Representative knows nothing. At least that is the conclusion of the Army and Navy men with whom I have talked; and I have talked with some of the best ones. Neither can Russia train and transport to the United States enough millions of men to defeat us on our own soil, for they likewise, I know, would be defeated. If we must fight Russia or any other power it must be with new weapons; and to place our reliance in the field of diplomacy on the mass armies advocated by the military is to jeopardize our very existence.

Let me suggest that the Russian people possess nothing that the American people want, and the American people possess nothing that the Russian people want. The quarrel is a quarrel between the leaders of the two countries. As for me, I am not as much afraid of what Russia may do to us as I am of what we are about to do to ourselves in this very prosperous country.

Let us take up a second significant point concerning the Army program. What is it that we have fought for in all the wars of our history? We believed—at least we were told—that we were fighting for human liberty. We were fighting in the first war to make the world safe for democracy. This time we were told that we were fighting for human liberty. In the Revolutionary War it was for independence; in the Civil War, emancipation. In World War I we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy; in World War II, for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. These were all things of the human spirit, which we have added up to mean democracy. That is the only thing for which our boys would fight. They were not mercenary soldiers, and they would not fight for money. Those were the reasons given by our statesmen to cause them to fight.

It is true that between wars our soldiers were often cheated of the fruits of their victory, nevertheless the fight for democracy has continued relentlessly. We must now ask ourselves how the Army program of military compulsion will affect our democratic liberties.

Looking at the Army dispassionately for what it really is, it is clear to all of us that the Army is not a democratic institution. Its structure is fundamentally absolutist and totalitarian. It is highly centralized, with orders given from the top down. It is founded on implicit obedience to the will of the commander. Its leadership is ultra-conservative and reactionary. It has been isolated from the people of the United States for so many generations that it has little understanding of the point of view of the average civilian. Historically it has shown little concern for the views of the people.

Even in the hearings on this bill for an extension of the draft its higher staff officers have practically boycotted the meetings and have left only third-string staff officers to attend the meetings. I wish to repeat that for the benefit of every GI who was in this war. Even in the hearings on this bill for an extension of the draft—and I hold in my hand the record—the higher staff officers practically boycotted the meetings. As Al

Smith used to say, "Let us look at the record." What do we find?

We do not find the testimony of MacArthur. Oh, no. We find that in these hearings on the bill for an extension of the draft, which determines the lives of literally millions of boys and girls, the higher staff officers of the Army have practically boycotted the hearings, and have left, not first-class men, but only third-string staff officers to attend the hearings, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of millions of our citizens testified in opposition—representatives of labor, the farmer, education, religion, veterans, and dozens of others, both in groups and individually.

The Army talks of democracy, but its leadership has little understanding of the inner meaning of democracy, and certainly has no machinery within its structure to carry democracy into practical effect. This totalitarian Army is stratified into classes, particularly between the officer class and the enlisted class. This caste system is a throwback to the middle ages, when the overlord could not stand on an equal footing, either officially or socially, with his vassals. We now observe the strange phenomenon of feudalism making its last stand in the military forces of a democratic America. How can we explain to the mother of two boys, one a lieutenant and the other a sergeant, that one is a gentleman by act of Congress and the other is not? One has the privilege of an officers' club and a well-managed officers' mess, and the other eats his food from a mess kit. One is not permitted to meet on the basis of fraternity with the other without risk of military discipline. I do not wish to be misconstrued as advocating any relaxation of military discipline or in favoring a complete leveling off of all men in the military service. Any organization, civilian as well as military, must have discipline. But I do protest with all the vigor at my command against caste distinctions by reason of artificial distinctions of rank. We are all aware of the fact that the first sergeant of an organization can fraternize with his men. Yet no one in the Army possesses a stronger position in respect to discipline than does the first sergeant. The same is true within the officer caste. The colonel and the lieutenant may fraternize at a cocktail party in the evening, but the next morning there is no question as to who gives the orders. If we can maintain discipline within each caste, we can obtain discipline even though we wipe out rigid class differentiations and permit fraternizing between American citizens.

Mr. President, this absolutist Army presents another question to democracy. Its system of justice is just as absolute and arbitrary as is the rest of its machinery. We are aware of the fact that the Secretary of War has appointed a civilian board of outstanding jurists to investigate the Army's system of justice. That investigation is long overdue. Stated bluntly, there is actually no system of justice in the Army, but, rather a system of discipline and punishment. Every phase of judicial action revolves about the commander. The commander

may, and often does order charges preferred against a soldier. When so inclined, he may then select the most hard-boiled field officer to investigate the charges, and he may call in the investigating officer and make it clear to him that military discipline has fallen off in the command and that it would be quite in order to put the screws on the accused. Naturally, the investigating officer, in order to establish a record for efficiency for his commander, strives to please. The accused is, therefore, prejudged before he goes to trial.

Mr. President, in my judgment there is not a Senator upon this floor who has not received, time and time again, letters from some GI who has been court-martialed, or letters from his father or mother or some other relative, saying that the young man has not had a square deal; and, upon investigation by some of the very Senators who now are upon this floor, some of the sentences have been reduced.

The members of the court are aware that the commander considers the accused guilty. That fact makes all members of the court suspect of prejudice. The commander designates the composition of the court. He selects another hard-boiled officer as president of the court, and he backs him up with several experienced officers. He selects the best officer as prosecutor; and, too often, he selects an inexperienced officer as defense counsel. No enlisted man can sit on a court or be tried by a jury of enlisted men. Each man is reasonably sure, therefore, that the court will be prejudiced in part and inexperienced in part, and that his counsel will be inexperienced and under the domination of the president of the court. How can we expect abstract justice to emerge from such a situation?

I wish to make clear that I do not accuse all members of Army courts of being callous of the rights of the accused, because as good American citizens some of them do their best. What I do insist is that the system itself does not lend itself to the administration of justice.

After the trial the commander has another opportunity to inject himself into the situation. He must review the case for sufficiency of evidence to convict, only. He may reduce the sentence, but he cannot increase it. He may have called in the president of the court, in advance, and reminded him that it would be a good thing for discipline within the command if stiff sentences were imposed for certain offenses. When he reviews the case, if he is in a happy mood he may cut off a part of the sentence, but if he is in an ugly mood he may permit the entire sentence to stand. The level of punishment in that command may rise and fall like the tides of the ocean, according to the whim of the commander at a particular moment. The staff judge advocate who assisted the commander in reviewing the case has one client—his commander. The Judge Advocate of the Army, to whom the case finally is forwarded, has one client—the War Department. Neither is interested primarily in the GI. Neither is interested in the poor GI who may be away from home for the

first time. Neither is interested primarily in abstract justice, but only in protecting the commander.

At last the victim ends up in the guard-house. There we find our 18-year-old boy, or 19- or 20- or 21- or 22- or 23- or 24- or 25- or 26-year-old boy, who has gone absent without leave because of homesickness. There we find him placed behind the bars or forced to work about the reservation, guarded by another 18-year-old boy who carries a loaded gun. If the prisoner tries to run out on his guard, he is shot in the back—as happened recently at Fort Sheridan, where two such boys were filled full of buckshot when they tried to run out on a leaf-raking job.

I have discussed this point at length because of the effect of this military system upon our concept of democracy. I insist that if we place our 18-year-old boys in an establishment which is structurally absolutist in character, under leadership which has little understanding of the fundamental spirit of democracy, which has no techniques for carrying it into effect, which is reactionary in its outlook and has little belief in freedom of speech or freedom of press or freedom of assembly, which demands complete and unquestioning obedience of orders, which is split into two contending castes, and which has no true system of justice under law to protect the rights of the individual, we shall end up with less democracy, instead of more.

Mr. President, were we to continue the draft program during peacetime it is appalling to realize that in the Army's total system of military compulsion every American boy would eventually be conditioned to the Army's existing philosophies. We cannot permit that to take place without understanding very clearly that we will be headed for complete destruction of our American democracy.

Senators, allow me to discuss a third important point, namely, the influence of the military program on the morals of our youth. Again, I am not concerned with only the provisions for extending the draft but also the long-range determination of the Army to inflict compulsory military training upon us. We may be sure that if we now extend the Draft Act, next spring the Army will be back before us with its compulsory military training program, as well as with fresh demands for additional manpower to implement the training program. The point I wish to make applies equally to both phases of the situation.

The Army would like to make it appear that training in the Army develops our young men. It mentions dental work. Of course, that would be for men only, because girls are to be given no consideration under such a program. The Army conveniently forgets to remind us that it skims the cream of our young manhood and throws back upon society all those who most need proper health protection. The Army mentions courses of instruction in basic subjects for the illiterate. The Army spent thousands of dollars of the taxpayers money in preparing a brochure for the purpose of

selling Congress on the value of military training.

Mr. President, allow me to remind Senators, if they need being reminded, that this is not a youth program. All the benefits to which I have referred, and which the Army intimates can be achieved through military training, merely emphasizes the fact that society has failed in some of its primary purposes. Every benefit which has been mentioned can be achieved more efficiently within the home surroundings if he will spend an amount of money in behalf of the girls of the country who are its future mothers, equal to the amount we are willing to spend for the boys.

Mr. President, at the time the joint resolution to give England \$3,750,000,000 was before the Senate, I introduced certain bills. Some of them would have taken care of the very situation which the Army says it is now going to take care of by the proposed extension of the draft. I ask Senators to think of what would happen in this country if we were to give \$3,750,000,000 to the States, as I suggested, for the purpose of protecting the health not only of the youth of those States, but of every man, woman, and child in America. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] explained on the floor of the Senate a few days ago what happened in Louisiana when three hospitals were erected in that State and it was made possible for any indigent man, woman, and child to go to those hospitals, free of charge, and remain for 1 day, 1 week, 1 month, 1 year, or even longer if necessary, in order to receive proper medical treatment. In Louisiana a person is not required to be entirely indigent if his doctor certifies that he is in need of medical care. Compare that fact, Mr. President, with the fact that hundreds of thousands of our boys were refused admission to the armed forces because they were illiterate or physically unfit. I do not need to tell Senators what was the nature of the test which was employed. As everyone knows, the test, or examination, was finally so trivial as to be almost laughable.

Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from Walcott, N. Dak. A man there was receiving an old-age pension of \$40 a month. It was not sufficient for him to take care of his needs. He did some work on the side and, believe it or not, the Bureau of Internal Revenue charged him an income tax on his entire pension. When I telephoned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue I was told that I would be given an opinion as to whether a person can be required to pay an income tax on his old-age pension, but I have not as yet received the opinion.

In one of the bills which I introduced there was a requirement that farm-to-market roads be provided so that farmers could transport their products to market.

Mr. President, only yesterday I read upon this floor an article in Life magazine which insulted every farmer in America. The article stated that the farmers of America were so greedy that they preferred to keep their wheat on the farms even though in doing so it meant famine all over Europe. It will be

remembered that I read the statement of William Plath, the president of the Farm Bureau of North Dakota. I also read the statement of Mr. John Kasper, State chairman of the production marketing administration of North Dakota. The president of the Farm Bureau said that the wheat had not been delivered because of poor roads. Mr. President, a farmer may live 5 miles from an elevator and he may have a good road all the way from his farm to the elevator with the exception of one or two mudholes. If those mudholes were repaired he could drive his truck to the elevator and transport perhaps a hundred bushels of wheat. However, as every farmer boy knows, one or two mudholes make it pretty hard for a truck to get through. So, if we had used within our own country the \$3,750,000,000 which the Senate has already voted to give to England, one-half of which, according to my suggestion had been used to repair farm-to-market roads, the farmers would have been enabled to transport their grain to market and there would be no famine in Europe today.

Mr. President, one of the very men on the emergency relief organization, appointed by the President, is Tom Campbell, who comes from Harding, Mont., who is known as the wheat king of the world. What happened to Mr. Campbell? It will be remembered that a day or two or three or four after the 30-cent bonus was offered, Mr. Campbell said that he was getting tractors from some place or other, caterpillar tractors and other tractors, so that he could deliver 400,000 bushels of wheat to the elevators.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. TOBEY. Who has the floor, Mr. President, may I ask?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota refuses to yield.

Mr. LANGER. But Mr. Campbell could not deliver the 400,000 bushels of wheat in Montana to the elevator and get it to the market. Mr. Campbell, living out in the country, may have had a good road all the way to the place where the elevators were located, but, unfortunately there likely were mud holes which he was unable to cross. If we had \$3,750,000,000 we could fix up every mud hole in America on the roads, so that the farmers could get their products to the market.

Remember also, Mr. President, that there was a great deal of joking at one of the bills because it provided for a urinalysis. Yet some of the leading doctors of this country, including the members of the Rockefeller Foundation, have pleaded—they came to my State when I was Governor and sent men there to plead—to get enough money for making urinalyses, because it would save literally hundreds of thousands of lives all over the country. For the little expense of 2½ cents, three diseases can be detected. Yet, the majority leader said it was so important to give \$3,750,000,000 to England—a loan, he called it—that he said he was perfectly willing to put aside the

bill extending the draft until a joint resolution for a loan to England could be passed.

Mr. President, I maintain that the Army glosses over the fact that Army camps have not changed much in thousands of years. It was for that reason perhaps that the leaders of religion and the leaders in education came before the committees and protested.

I submit that the Army cannot be made to substitute for the home, the school, the church, and society in general in maintaining restraints on morality. The situation becomes worse now that the war is over, the men are idle, there is no excitement of war to keep up their standards, and their efforts appear little better than boondoggling. Unquestionably, a general deterioration in morale, followed by a deterioration in morality, is taking place throughout the Army. And now the Army proposes to fill all quotas from the only remaining source, the 18- and 19-year-old boys. We often speak of the boys who fought the war as the "lost generation." Now the Army proposes to make of each generation a "lost generation." We may be certain that all these boys, drawn out of their homes at too early an age, will require the same sort of reconditioning to fit them for a return to civilian life as is now required for the boys who fought the war. We will be wasting our youth, and wasting it to no purpose, if we subscribe blindly to this Army program.

Although 18- and 19-year-old boys are perhaps to be exempted now, the fact remains that in the testimony the Army indicated it wanted them, the Army said it would have to have them. The Army at that time was going to send them across the ocean and it was only when the religious leaders and leaders in education and farmers and laborers protested, when those brave, outstanding, courageous men appeared against the Army leaders and begged—it was only then, when the Army saw public opinion aroused, that the Army officials said, "Well, we will draft them, we will take the 18- and 19-year-old boys, but we will not send them across. We will keep them here." Of course, they said at first, "We will send them across to take care of surplus goods, to take care of the jeeps and the trucks. We will send a part of them over to Guam to take care of half a million cases of beer. We will send some boys over there to take care of that."

Be it said to the everlasting credit of the religious and educational leaders of America that they were able to arouse public opinion to such an extent that in the House of Representatives an overwhelming majority said, "You have gone far enough, you brass hats of the Army. You are not going to take 17- and 18-year-old boys."

That was a great day in America, Mr. President, when the religious and educational leaders could arouse the conscience of the people of America and formulate public opinion to such an extent.

So I say, Mr. President, Congress must face another practical problem if it passes this bill to extend the draft. Are we prepared to follow through with the necessary action to enforce it after we pass it? This bill is very unpopular through-

out the country, and especially with the parents of 18-year-old boys. If they were convinced that the draft were necessary for reasons of national security, they would be willing to support the measure, but the Army has not, thus far, convinced them that national security is at stake. They do not want to give up their sons to guard property all over the world, or to end up in armies of occupation all over the world, with all of the demoralizing influences to which these boys will be subjected, or to permit their sons to be used as instruments of shabby international power politics. They were willing to sacrifice their sons for democracy, but are not willing to sacrifice them for all of the oil wells in Iran or of the entire world. They have little faith in the integrity of the Army, for the Army broke faith with them before when it promised that their 18-year-old boys would be given a full year of conditioning to fit them for military duties, only to break its promise, with the result that boys were killed all over the world who had only a few weeks' training.

Mr. President, how well I remember the day when the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] rose on this floor to ask about a boy who was the son of a neighbor of his, who had been killed after only a few weeks of training, in violation of the promise which had been made by the War Department. How well I remember the alleged excuse. It was that he had voluntarily signed some kind of a paper waiving the months and months of training here, so that he could get to the front right away.

Mr. President, I and others, the religious and educational leaders, farmers and laborers, and businessmen see this program largely as another WPA, another boondoggling program for the unemployed. They remember that many of our ancestors ran away from their home in Europe in order to escape conscription, and wonder if our boys must now run away from their homes in order to escape conscription in the United States. They are not fooled by public polls, for many vote in such polls who have no sons to sacrifice, and only those who are directly concerned should have a right to vote. Too often the polls reveal nothing more than the effectiveness of deliberate propaganda of those who are determined on fastening this program of compulsion upon the United States. If we pass this measure, therefore, I predict that it cannot be enforced any more than prohibition was enforced. This draft measure deals with the American way of life, and with the lives of our future generations. If we pass it we must be prepared to strengthen the powers of the Department of Justice, to build more jails, and to set up more courts to try our young men who want no part of this un-American program of military compulsion.

At this point I cannot help but ask: What does the Army propose to accomplish by this program? What is its purpose? Why do Army officers lobby up and down the halls of Congress, on Army pay and at Government expense, to force this program on the American people? I have found no one except the Army

and one or two other reactionary organizations that want this program. The Navy is only mildly interested—the Navy, I repeat, is only mildly interested, as it is doing all right on a voluntary basis. The Marine Corps is not at all interested. The Marine Corps does not want the draft. It is not interested in it. And the Navy is only mildly interested in it.

Why is the Army so interested in getting this program in spite of public opinion aroused by the religious and educational leaders of America?

Let me try to answer my own question. I believe that the answer goes as deep as the American way of life. I have already pointed out that the extension of the draft cannot be justified in the slightest degree on the basis of national security. The Army has tried to blackmail Congress to put through this measure by threatening to hold on to the fathers still in the service. It has tried to frighten Congress by reiterating that if this measure is not passed we will be gambling with national security. I am convinced that instead of gambling with national security if we do not pass the measure, we will be gambling with the American way of life if we do pass it. One of the reasons we fought the Revolutionary War was because we detested the militarism which the British forced upon our early settlers. We came out of the war with an ingrained antagonism toward militarism, so much so that we were reluctant to have an Army even of 2,000 men. After the Revolutionary War we were reluctant to have even an Army of 2,000 men. That ingrained suspicion of militarism has become part of the American tradition, and has a part in making us willing to fight to destroy militarism abroad.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry, but I can not yield, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I wish I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. What a change has taken place since that time.

After the Revolutionary War our Army was small and scattered. Our wars were small, chiefly with the Indians on our frontiers, and the Army was given a free reign in fighting them, since, except in the Civil War, the rest of the population was not too deeply concerned. World War I saw a marked change in the situation. We learned that warfare had become the business of the entire population, yet the military was given major control over the war. World War II carried that phase to its logical conclusion, for the war became a levy en masse with every man, woman, and child in the country directly concerned. Notwithstanding that fact, in the old accepted manner we turned the war over to the military. Every farmer in America, every businessman, every wife, the head of every household, every man who cannot get a shirt, every woman who cannot get nylon stockings, every man, woman or child who cannot get butter or bread—every one of them knows that

Congress abdicated. Everyone knows that we turned the war over to the military. Congress, industry, labor, education, religion, and society as a whole abdicated their powers to the military because Americans said "We have got to win this war." The people were willing to do that, Mr. President, at that time, but the war has been over for a year, and I for one say that the Congress and industry and labor and education, religion, and society should no longer abdicate to the military.

During the war every path led to the Pentagon Building. Everyone took orders from the military, for the leaders of the armed forces held a monopoly on national security. Our Army leaders, conditioned to small tasks in a small Army in the piping times of peace, had little experience in handling the difficult problems of logistics of an entire Nation at war. It is true we did a splendid job, but through the efforts in many cases of our civilians in uniform.

Now the war is over, but the Army still insists that it holds the monopoly on national security. It maintains the fiction of a continuation of a national emergency, when no emergency exists any longer, in order to keep control over men already drafted. It accepts as a certainty the fiction that this emergency will continue for at least another year, for it counts on keeping all draftees in service for at least 18 months. It presented a program of compulsory military training which would give it control over all of the manpower of the Nation during at least one period. Its insistence on continuing the draft is but another phase of its control over manpower. It proposes to control the atomic bomb for military purposes. All of these proposals, if carried into effect, would give the Army tremendous power, in times of peace, over the entire national manpower and national economy.

On top of it all the Army is fighting for a merger of the three forces in the expectation, no doubt, that an Army leader will be the first to head up the new organization. Desirable as I think a merger might be from the standpoint of bringing about greater cooperation between the various forces, let us not forget that cooperation cannot be achieved merely by piling one bureau head on top of another bureau head. Confusion and compartmentalization already exist within each of the forces, in spite of the fact that each has its own head. Cooperation and understanding are achieved from the lower levels on up through to the top by training, sound organization, and actual experience.

The proposal for unification has this danger: One man might emerge at the top and be obeyed by the Army, under its indoctrination of unquestionable obedience, or one man in a military hierarchy might emerge and find it easy to negotiate with one man heading up the armed forces.

Militarism is a dangerous and ugly thing, whether it be German militarism, Japanese militarism, Russian militarism, or American militarism. Herein lies the greatest danger of the total Army program.

We are now the strongest militaristic nation in the world. We still have the most powerful army, in spite of the Army's program of demobilization through disintegration, for all the men demobilized are still in the reserve. We have the largest Navy and the largest air power. We have the atomic bomb, and we have shown the world that we have no hesitation to use it not only once but twice, and that after Japan had already been defeated. There was no military need to use it. The attitude of the Army on the atomic bomb has shown that we stand ready to use it again—and I might say "again, and again, and again."

We have a powerful industry to back up any military program we may wish to undertake. Our scientific achievements are unsurpassed. We have seized bases all over the world, pointed at the hearts of our former allies. Our international policy has been aggressive and almost endless. So today the United States emerges as a great military nation to be feared and distrusted by the peoples of the world. We inherit the tradition of Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and Mussolini.

Again we come too late, for militarism died when the first atomic bomb was dropped at Hiroshima. Certainly militarism founded on mass armies came to an end with the development of the atomic bomb. Few military leaders in the United States or anywhere else in the world seem to have grasped that fact.

We are beginning to acquire a fatalistic feeling that we are living at the present time in a state of armed truce or armistice; that our soldiers, as suggested by Dr. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, are merely home on furlough; and that world war may break out at any time. The only changes we anticipate have to do with a new alinement of powers when warfare is resumed.

If war starts all over again, what sort of a war will it be? Will it be a war of bayonets and 30-caliber rifles, tanks, landing barges, flame throwers, artillery, and all the implements of war which we have accumulated in such quantities? I realize that it will be a great temptation to our military leaders to commence where we left off, with all the techniques and equipments with which they are familiar, and which they have been trained to use. Herein lies our greatest danger, for the next war, if there is to be a next war—which Heaven forbid—will bear little resemblance to the wars of the past.

It may not be waged with men in uniform at all, but with scores of skilled saboteurs trained in the secret placement of weapons of terror. It will in all probability be a pushbutton war, in which the engines of terror are suddenly released at a given time and entire cities are blown up in a few seconds, or it may be waged with disease germs released to spread death and destruction throughout the Nation. If it is a war of men in uniform it may be fought in the stratosphere with atomic bombs carried high above the earth by super B-29's, or projected half-way around the earth as guided missiles, radio-guided planes, or super bombs; or we may develop a death

ray, with which the Japs were successfully experimenting before the end of the war. If they succeeded in killing rabbits at 300 feet, it will not be difficult to develop rays to kill men at 3,000 miles.

Such will be the weapons actually used. Every dollar that we spend on misnamed forces of security will be wasted. This is the reality which we must face.

And what is the ultimate reality? It is the inescapable fact that these weapons will certainly be developed; that no other kinds of weapons will be used. But if we use these weapons we destroy civilization. The mind of man has caused us to gain control over power so great as to be beyond our comprehension. If we now use that power for human destruction, it will be a comparatively simple matter to destroy humanity. The tremendous potentialities of these weapons of terror automatically outlaw them for warfare, and automatically outlaw war itself. Universal disarmament and peace have now become the most urgent military necessity.

I repeat that, Mr. President. Universal disarmament and peace have now become the most urgent military necessity. No military commander will undertake a campaign which is doomed to failure. No military commander can develop or plan a campaign and present it to his superiors or to the President of the United States as a plan of campaign, and then state that the campaign must end in failure. Yet that is exactly the position in which all commanders find themselves today.

General Eisenhower might well report to the President at the present time that the only salvation of the United States for the future is the prevention of war through diplomatic means, because armies and armaments and military force have become completely useless to assure the security of the United States. Civilization is moving toward the precipice. It is moving forward in a thick fog and may plunge over the edge at any moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that I cannot yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Utah, whom I love very much.

This cannot be an armistice, or peace between battles. The present moment must mark the end of warfare for all time if civilization is to survive. Whether we like it or not, and whether we are mentally prepared to meet the issue or not, solutions in world affairs cannot be found in military force. They must be found in human intelligence and in human understanding.

Mr. President, that is why I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the hundreds of letters which I have received from my constituents in the State of North Dakota. For example, a little while ago I read a letter from the secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association in Grand Forks, N. Dak., a young man who had served in five campaigns in this war, begging that we do not have universal military conscription. I wish to read that letter again so that the people of America may know what the youth of America is thinking, what

those men who have put on the uniform are thinking. This young man wrote me on April 24 as follows:

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription. I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war and feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription.

I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, as expressed in his radio address over CBS on Saturday, April 20.

I will be waiting with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

LEONARD H. ENGSTROM,
General Secretary.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the president of the North Dakota School of Forestry, one of the outstanding schools in the State of North Dakota. His letter is dated April 23. He says:

I have been informed that S. 2057 is now before the Senate and that it includes the extension of the draft to 18- and 19-year-old boys.

It is true that under the provisions of the amendments which have been adopted by the House of Representatives there is now an attempt to exempt 18- and 19-year-old boys from the draft, but I call attention to the fact that Senator after Senator has risen upon this floor this afternoon and has said that he reluctantly acquiesces in the amendments; that he is opposed to this measure; that he might vote for it, but would do so reluctantly. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Army wanted the 18- and 19-year-old boys for 18 months more, and that it was only after the leaders of the religious groups and the educational groups and the farmers and the representatives of labor came before the committee and only after they aroused public opinion that the House of Representatives, sensing public opinion, adopted the two amendments. And you will remember, Mr. President, that only a few days ago our distinguished majority leader said he was in favor of extending the draft or allowing it to perish—he did not care which—but that England had to be taken care of first, and that we had to vote for the \$3,750,000,000 for England, even though the draft did die.

Mr. President, in the letter to which I have just referred, Mr. C. N. Nelson, of the North Dakota School of Forestry, a leading educator in North Dakota, and the president of that great school, says:

Frankly, I cannot see that young men of that age would be as valuable for police duty in occupied territories as men who have reached greater maturity. I believe that you will agree with me in the statement that young men of 18 or 19 are particularly vulnerable to the vicious influences of military conscription.

Let me add that I do agree with him. I read further from his letter:

If it looks as if this extension is going through, it would seem that any boy of this age who is a bona fide registrant at any institution of higher learning should be exempted. We must remember that we already have a 5-year lapse in the educational progress of our population. It will take years and years to "catch up." I do not

believe we can afford to do so, particularly since most other countries allowed students in science to continue their education, even during the war.

It would seem to me that an effective occupational policy, our foreign relations, and the national welfare demand that we consider this question in the light of its effect upon the future of our democracy. I am convinced that we have always paid more for the lack of education than what we have paid for education.

Sincerely yours,

C. N. NELSON,
President.

I repeat that there we have the judgment of the great president of a great school in North Dakota—in fact, one of the great schools in the United States.

It is a well-established principle that unless positive evidence exists to the contrary, anyone who commits suicide is insane. If anyone has any doubt about that let him go to the teachers of philosophy in any of our large universities. The urge to survive is so powerful in the individual that only the mentally unbalanced destroy their own lives.

Today humanity is in that situation. It stands with a gun at its temples and it is about to pull the trigger. If it pulls the trigger it will be because we have suddenly gone insane. I cannot believe—I refuse to believe—that we have arrived at that unhappy state. I still have hope that we may draw back from the abyss and may save ourselves while yet there is time. Who dares to give the command, "Fire!" or to pull the trigger of the weapon pointed at our own head?

At this particular time, as never before in the history of the world, there is a crying need for leadership and for effective machinery to bring about a new world order. The United States has assumed a degree of leadership in setting up the United Nations, which, as I said 2 hours ago, is the only instrumentality in existence which may lead the way to universal peace. However, at a time when this very Senate had a chance to do away with the veto power in connection with the United Nations it refused to do so. Yet today the secretary of the United Nations says the United Nations cannot succeed—he said so in an article which was printed in last Sunday's newspapers—unless the veto power provision is eliminated from the Charter of the United Nations. Although the necessity for eliminating the veto power from the Charter of the UN was brought to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], yet the Senate did nothing about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. President, when I read what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said upon that occasion I stated that he compared the United Nations Charter to the Constitution of the United States, and that, in my opinion, the Thirteen Colonies never would have joined in that Constitution if New York or Vir-

ginia or any other large State had had a veto power over the other States. But when I brought that matter to the attention of the Senate it availed for nothing.

Yet, Mr. President, today we find former Associate Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, the man who did so much to make the Charter of the United Nations a reality, speaking in the State of Pennsylvania and arousing public opinion to the fact that the veto power must be abolished from the Charter of the United Nations if the United Nations is to be a success.

So, Mr. President, it is at this particular time that our Army leaders have chosen to start the United States off as a leader in a new militarism race under the fatal assumption that we have a head start in that race and can maintain that advantage. Our Army leaders turn away from the thought of war with Russia. Mr. President, we are always prone to underestimate the possibility of war, as we did in the case of the Japanese. Now we are underestimating the Russians. It would be as foolish as it would be dangerous to assume that Russia has no weapon, even now, to counter our own atomic bomb, or that within a year or two, most assuredly, Russia will have such weapons.

So, Mr. President, I repeat what I said earlier in the afternoon—namely, that the common people of the United States want no war with Russia, any more than the common people of Russia want a war with the United States of America. Today the mass armies which our military leaders propose to build have no reality in fighting a war. The program of compulsory military training, the continuation of the fiction of an emergency—when there is actually no emergency—in order to permit the Army to retain control over our soldiers, and, finally, this program to extend the draft so as to give the Army continued control over the youth of the Nation, have no value for military security. All that this program can accomplish is to inject ill will and suspicion at this great moment in history. When good will is required as never before, the Army demands a program of militarization of the United States which would destroy the very foundations of international understanding. We cannot have it both ways, Mr. President. Either we must support the United Nations or we must go in for militarization. We cannot have both. They are inconsistent with each other. Yet, our Army talks in one breath about our commitments to the United Nations and of the force which will be required to fulfill our obligations, and in the other breath it demands the largest military force in the world. It must have its tongue in its cheek when it presents such an inconsistent program.

I should like to know what is behind all this, Mr. President. Is it indeed a program which is desired by the Army? Do our military leaders indeed believe that their program will insure further the security of the United States? If they are sincere, however mistakenly, must we swallow their ideas, knowing that they are conditioned mentally to

thinking in terms of war and destruction, and that they have no responsibility for the furtherance of peace? Have they deluded themselves? Has the wish been father to the thought that mass armies, calling for very high rank, promotion, and pay have any significance? Or is there someone or some influence behind the Army, needling it on, and using it as an instrument for selfish purposes? If so, who is it or what is it? The people of the United States do not want this program. The Congress does not want the program, because only a few hours ago Senator after Senator rose on this floor and said that he voted reluctantly for the program. The entire proposal goes counter to every instinct and every tradition of the American people. Are we to be bribed, frightened, or blackmailed into accepting militarization at a time when so many of our sons have already died to destroy militarism abroad? Are we to lose the fruits of our victory through the influence and the leadership of officers of the United States Army? I assert, Mr. President, that the mantle of militarization does not look becoming over the cadet grey of West Point. This is not the time to fasten militarization upon the United States. This is the time to reanalyze our entire military policy in the light of the total national situation and of the new weapons of destruction which are now at hand. This problem cannot be settled in a piecemeal manner such as the Army is trying to solve it. It must be considered in its entirety, and long-range solutions must be found which will lead to the new world order, which is the most desperate need of all the world at the present time.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest a course of action to achieve this much-needed objective. First of all, I recommend that we kill once and for all the proposal to extend the draft, and that we be prepared likewise to kill any proposal for compulsory military service which the Army may present at a later date. I recommend also that we give serious consideration, even now, to declaring an end to the spurious emergency which is being maintained by Executive fiction. I repeat, Mr. President, that months ago I introduced a bill declaring this war to be at an end, and yet that bill has not been given a hearing before any committee. Months ago I introduced a bill which would end the draft. Months ago I introduced a bill which provided that if some of the foreign countries were to be occupied continually, we use the manpower of some of our allies in occupying those countries.

Mr. President, how many boys from Mexico, how many boys from Brazil, how many boys from Argentina, how many boys from Uruguay or Ecuador, how many boys from any of our allied countries are being used in the occupied zones of Europe and Japan? Why should boys from North Dakota, from Michigan, from New York, from Illinois, and other States be used in the occupation of those zones? Why should not the boys of our allied countries be stationed in those

zones, and in the same proportion as are the boys of the United States? So, Mr. President, months ago I introduced bills with regard to this entire subject.

Once again I want to make my record clear, and I want it to be available to every North Dakota boy so that he may read it and be informed. I want that record to be where every constituent in my State may look at it between now and election day, which is only 6 weeks away. Far be it from me, Mr. President, to hold my Senate seat by any cowardly act. I shall not sit here in silence because election day is only 6 weeks away. I believe that when the constituents of a Senator send him to the United States Senate he is sent there to vote his honest convictions, and that it is his duty to vote his convictions whether election day is 1 week, 4 weeks, 4 months, 4 years, or nearly 6 years away. It may be, as the CIO and the PAC have said, they will defeat me in my campaign for election in the State of North Dakota. They have boasted that they will do so. It has also been boasted that the Republican Party has under its control approximately \$6,000,000 to use in the campaign if necessary. But I promise every Senator that when Langer goes out of that door he will go out with his head up and with his conscience clear, knowing that he has represented honestly and to the best of his ability his constituents in his home State of North Dakota, and that he voted as he believes an overwhelming majority of the people of that State would have voted if they had had an opportunity to vote on the proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. President, while some of the Members of the Senate may not agree with me, I believe sincerely that we would be making a serious mistake if we were to agree to the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have the highest regard and the greatest admiration.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I want to keep the record straight. Months ago I introduced a bill to have the war declared to be at an end. Months ago I introduced a bill declaring an end to the draft. When the war started I wanted the GI's to be given decent compensation; not \$50 a month, but \$100 a month. In that effort the distinguished former Senator from Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, who was at one time the first national commander of the American Legion, backed me on this floor.

Mr. President, I believe that the Army has in its power means to establish such a military force as might be needed to protect our country during the years which lie ahead. Allow me to remind you, Mr. President, that when Germany was deprived of her mass armies following World War I she found means to increase her power by switching to new weapons so that she became stronger than ever before. We would be doing the Army a favor if we were to require it to modernize. By eliminating this useless program of military compulsion we would achieve an important psychological result in our international relationships. We would show the world

that we are not the hypocrites which the program makes us out to be. We can take the lead in eliminating conscription all over the world. Such conscription will never be an effectual guaranty of peace since the nations do not now wish to maintain mass armies. The elimination of the program would help to bring about a better understanding between nations, and would lift the present terrible burden of taxation from the necks of all the peoples of the world. I say, Mr. President, that it is our duty to assume leadership in this direction. We should not, however, assume it by increasing, increasing, and increasing everlastingly greater armies, greater armies, larger armies and larger armies. Our primary problem in connection with the national security is psychological. Our little minds are unable to grasp the fact that we must not have any more world wars. We have become so used to wars and rumors of wars that they have become a part of our environment. We cannot imagine a world in which wars do not take place. It will require time and education to convince our people of the realities of the situation. Very well; let us be realistic. Let us admit that the United States cannot abolish its own armies in this critical moment in the world's history until other nations do likewise, or until a new world order is established under the United Nations Organization. In this situation we cannot commit ourselves to obsolete mass armies, and thus serve notice on the world that it will take us two to three years to get ready for a war. If the Army were strictly honest with itself and with us, it would realize that it has no intention of committing itself to mass armies, for it has established special powerful units to develop the new weapons. It is holding onto the old weapons because of its own inertia, because it is incapable of the daring act of abolishing them now that they have become useless, and because of reasons of sentiment. It likes the old armies which have become familiar.

Again I want to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Navy does not want this extension of the draft law, the Marines do not want it, only the Army is here begging and pleading for it. So I say, Mr. President, that we must build our armies about the new weapons. We must call in our top military leaders, who had experience in the new weapons, our scientists, our industrialists, and others who can contribute to the development of a really modern military force. Only after the basic factors have been established can the final problem of manpower be tackled. The Army has put the cart before the horse. It is crying for manpower before it knows the weapons which are to be served. Perhaps all that we shall need is a corps of saboteurs.

Any army that we organize is certain to be a technical army. It will be made up of scientists and technicians of all sorts. Some of the best minds of the country must be brought into the Army.

In such an organization there will be no place for a feudalistic caste system.

The channels must be cleared for advancement from the bottom to the top. How unfair it is to have a young GI realize that he cannot advance, that he is held back by a caste system. Leaders at the top must be selected from individuals who have shown qualities of leadership and ability at lower levels. The barricade between an officer class and an enlisted class must be removed. Fraternization between citizen and citizen, between brother and brother, must be permitted if not encouraged.

The Army training system must be overhauled and correlated with training in industry and in our schools. During World War II the Army should have learned its lesson that it cannot train in new, highly specialized techniques, but must call upon other training facilities to help it do the job. That training program should be integrated in time of peace. It will be too late after war has started, if the war lasts only 24 to 48 hours, or at most a week or two.

Our Army must be justly administered. There can be no democracy in the United States if it is not founded on justice under law. The entire feudalistic judicial system of the Army must be completely revised to remove justice from the hands of the commander who, too often, used it as a club.

And very important, Mr. President, our technical army must be well paid. In that connection, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the debate in the House of Representatives yesterday. There was a very interesting debate on this particular question. Here were some men who within a few weeks have to face their constituents. They were told time and again that if they insisted on eliminating the 18- and 19-year-old boys, they would tie up the joint resolution, with the result that the legislation would not be enacted. I wish to read again what some of those great men said—and they are great, Mr. President. We have great men in the House of Representatives, men who are willing to sacrifice their positions because they believe they are right. I want to read what some of them said when they were debating this particular question on the floor of the House.

First, however, I wish to call attention to what some of my constituents in the State of North Dakota have had to say about this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have here a letter from Alexandria, N. Dak., a town in the very western part of the State, from one of the outstanding women of that place. She says:

DEAR SENATOR: Are we to be saddled with a never-to-get-rid-of military machine that will be our fate if the draft law is extended. Why the big army? We cannot afford it financially, nor can we afford to have our youth cast into the infernal machine as it is too corrupting. Our young lads thrown into such awful environment as military train-

ing is no more than a criminal institution where murder is being taught. A young man who was sent to Japan writes and tells of the houses of prostitution over there under Government supervision.

What are we doing to our youth? I trust you are not in favor of extending the draft law beyond May 15 and I never saw anyone who favors it. Farm boys are still being drafted and they are not surplus. Returning soldiers are not interested in work, especially the youth; somehow their interests are not what they used to be.

Food, food, yes; and still farmers are robbed of their help.

Hoping you will help defeat the draft bill which is a military enslavement bill, I am, Respectfully yours.

I might say, Mr. President, that what this woman says about farm help is absolutely true. The selective service is in full force and effect in North Dakota. I know of a case where two sons have been killed in the war, and there is only one boy left. When the Selective Service sent notice to him, his father and mother wrote to me. The reply they got from the Selective Service in North Dakota is typical. When this father and mother said, "We need this boy upon the farm," they were told to go hire somebody.

I say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Utah, that it is absolutely impossible to hire help in North Dakota and the Northwest. That is as true in Montana and South Dakota as it is in North Dakota. When one goes to an employment agency and says he wants to hire someone, they say, "It is too bad, but there is no help available." I can show the distinguished Senator, not scores, not hundreds, but petitions and letters signed by thousands of constituents in my State who say that it is absolutely impossible to hire help, absolutely impossible to keep on doing the work, and if the Senator will go through North Dakota in an automobile I can show him farms which have been abandoned, where crops have not been put in, some of them within 4 or 5 miles of some pretty good-sized cities.

What every sane man desires today is peace. We are making an armed camp of the United States. It only builds a war economy, and compels other countries to do likewise. The result is an armament race, while money which should go for food and clothing is poured down the drain of defense, or offense, as the case may be.

This an atomic age, and there is no sense in building a wall of bristling guns and ships manned with uniformed tarzans when an atomic bomb could sail across the horizon and land a knock-out blow instantaneously, crushing the industrial factories that feed the war machine. Our Army would be but another Maginot Line.

In "One World or None," 15 scientists responsible for the atomic bomb and Gen. H. H. Arnold and Walter Lippmann explain in simple terms the stark challenge. There is no defense against the atomic bomb, and there is no secret about its manufacture. Here is their own summary:

Atomic energy will bring death to the society that produced it if we do not adapt ourselves to it. * * * No program is sound

unless it recognizes the special duties of the United States, unless it is built upon the principle that our insight and our patience must be greater than that of all the others. * * * There is not much time.

What we need today is a moral regeneration. General Eisenhower said recently that without it the world would go up in an atomic explosion.

In this atomic age the draft is as unrealistic as a straw hat is on a rainy day. In the first place, if we fear that some country is planning to attack us in the future, our best defense is our industrial strength, our scientific progress, and young Americans with initiative, self-reliance and with a gift of leadership. In the last war we learned that such men usually came from liberal arts schools and not schools which had gone over completely to military training.

In the second place, and more to the point, I believe we should think in terms of preventing war and not planning for it. We should strive for a more regeneration that would result in a sane foreign policy based on moral law, rather than brute force, and in a liberal domestic policy dedicated to liberty and justice for all.

It is imperative that we reach a mutual understanding with all peoples everywhere, and not just a few million on the small island of Great Britain, whose good will we try to buy with \$3,750,000,000. Good will can never be bought, just as the friendship of an individual can never be bought.

There are certain definite steps we can take. First, we must insist on world disarmament and world control of atomic energy in view of the fact we know that a nation like Russia can produce the atom bomb in a few years.

Second, we must stop building Russia into a Frankenstein. We certainly do not want war with her, so why do we not try to sit across the conference table from her and reach an agreement whereby this world can live in peace?

Third. We have got to insist on justice to minority groups, and stop the insane policy of trying to starve Germany into extinction. Unhappy and starving people are a fertile bed for revolution and another Hitler. Hate produces only more hate. We are in reality destroying this Nation and the world. Yet, as Christians we have special duties to our less fortunate brethren, as is ably expressed by the 15 scientists who are frightened by the world-shaking bomb they have produced, when they said:

No program is sound unless it recognizes the special duties of the United States, unless it is built upon the principle that our insight and our patience must be greater than that of all others.

The Government and the people of the United States have seen fit to place their hope of peace in the United Nations. How the same people can approve the draft and military conscription is inconceivable to me. It is admitting defeat. In effect it is saying, "We know the United Nations will not work, so we are preparing for the war that is sure to come." We have got to make the United Nations more than military allies among victor powers—a friend behind whom brute force stalks ominously.

Walter Lippmann said in an article on May 7 of this year:

A duel is in progress between London and Moscow for the control of the German population, and its high military potential. As a result, the political reeducation of Germany about which we have heard so much, now consists of teaching the Germans that by exploiting the competition between Britain and Russia, making the two rivals bid against each other, they can recover the unity of Germany and make themselves the decisive military factor in European and world balance of power.

We shall commit the greatest folly of all if, instead of exposing and denouncing this mad Anglo-Soviet contest, we let ourselves be sucked into it, blindly following the leadership of the blind.

The United Nations is being used by both England and Russia as the legal excuse for carrying on their own selfish desires, and each has its tentacles outstretched to grab whatever political and economic advantages they can.

By meekly adhering to the United Nations, we are indicating approval of their actions for, despite the words shouted angrily in the Security Council, I say that brute force stalks the world.

Indeed, Mr. President, I repeat that we must be prepared for the next step, a psychological readjustment, as I said, of our point of view. The Army we propose to create can never be used except at the risk of destruction of world civilization.

If we build our techniques around the new weapons, we must do so openly. We must publicize the effect of our weapons throughout the world by radio, press, motion pictures, and practical demonstrations. We shall have nothing to lose and much to gain by such publicity. If we arm openly, we will have the satisfaction of knowing and of showing to the rest of the world that competition in armaments with the new weapons of terror means competition for world suicide. If we conceal the effects of such armament, we conceal the truth from our own people as well as all the peoples of other countries, and may blunder into destruction through ignorance.

Mr. President, I would recommend that we announce to all the world that the army we are creating is to be held in trust for the United Nations, and is to be turned over to that organization, in whole or in part, as soon as it is firmly established. When that time arrives we should be able to abolish all military force, except what we require to maintain internal order. Such an announcement would be evidence of good faith, would disarm suspicion, and would set an example for other nations to follow.

To supplement our armed forces at the international level, I would recommend that we establish, under the United Nations, international courts for the punishment of those who incite to war, just as domestically we punish those who incite to riot. We would not permit anyone to stand on the street corner and preach murder, yet we permit our columnists, our editors, our military leaders, to preach wars which will cause international catastrophe. It is high time that there should be summoned before the proper court the citizens of any nation

who incite to war; they should be tried, and, if found guilty, punished in advance, and not after the event, when it is too late.

We must also break the monopoly over national security now held by our military leaders. Warfare has become a matter of concern to every person in the United States, and not only to a few military leaders in the Pentagon Building. As a matter of fact, the Army will be the safest place to be in the next war, as it will be under cover and widely scattered. It is our citizens and our cities who will be the victims hereafter. They have a right to participate in assuring their own security. I recommend, therefore, that we establish a national security council to stand above our military forces and be composed of Members of Congress and representatives of management, labor, science, education, farmers, religion, and other similar groups.

Congress has been asked to extend selective service for another year. I say that it is time for us to assume the attitude of a stern and righteous father who knows that only destruction can result if the two bullies in the family of nations become locked in mortal combat—destruction not only to Russia and England but to the United States as well, since we shall be sucked into the conflict.

At the same time, Mr. President, we must denounce the vicious Morgenthau plan, under which our Government is carrying out a program of exterminating 15,000,000 Germans and reducing the whole nation to a state not unlike that of the stone age. This murderous policy is not only unbecoming to a Christian people; it is sheer insanity. We not only create a deep well of hatred in Germany, but we upset the entire economy of Europe, since this is an interdependent world. When the exports and imports of a nation like Germany are cut off the rest of the world suffers with her.

Mr. President, I wish to read from a letter written by the economic adviser to the American Army in Germany, dated in March of this year:

The greatest famine catastrophe of recent centuries is upon us now in central Europe. Our Government is letting down our military government in food deliveries promised, although what General Clay, General Draper, and General Hester asked for and were promised was the barest minimum for the survival of the people. We will be forced to reduce the rations from 1,550 to 1,000 calories a day.

Mr. President, we come now to the present situation in the Senate. I hold in my hand a pamphlet known as Capitol Gist, issued by the Capitol Gist Service and published at 100 C Street SE, Washington 3, D. C., to which I have for a long time subscribed. I find it to be a very good service, and that what it says usually is about right. I hold in my hand volume 9, No. 10, of Gist. It reads as follows:

ARMY WILL HAVE MORE THAN ITS 1,550,000 BY NEXT JULY, STATES REVERCOMB

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia. If the able Senator will add those figures he will find that on July 1 the Army will

have more than its 1,550,000 men (figures referred to are totaled below):

Army strength goal for July 1, 1946, 1,550,000

Approximate enlistments (by July 1, 1946)	
Officers	900,000
Philippine Scouts	150,000
Not in service a year	50,000
Draftees not in a year	226,000
	400,000

Total 1,726,000

If we follow this to its conclusion, the draft could be ended on May 15 without affecting the proper discharge of men from the Army. (P. 3258, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6.)

PAY INCREASE EFFECTS ON ENLISTMENTS NOT CONSIDERED IN ARMY ESTIMATES

Gen. Gordon E. Textor, Office of Chief of Staff, presented a personal survey to the Senate Military Affairs Committee estimating that should the draft be ended May 15 there would be no manpower deficits for the Army July 1, 1946, a 221,000 deficit on July 1, 1947, and a 336,000 deficit on July 1, 1948. (These estimates based on reducing terms of inductees from 24 to 18 months, thus hastening discharges.)

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey. General, may I ask whether you included in your figures the so-called inducements for enlistment which we have discussed this morning, such as the higher pay?

General TEXTOR. I didn't include the prospective pay increase. I think increased pay would help a lot and we would get higher type men. (Pp. 174-176, Senate hearings.)

ARMY LOST TRACK OF 300,000 INDUCTEES IN 1944, TESTIFIES COLONEL CONKLING

Col. Roscoe Conkling, formerly with Selective Service, testifying before Senate Military Affairs Committee: "About April 8, 1944, someone decided to check up a bit and discovered they had lost track of 300,000 inducted men. They wanted General Hershey immediately to stop all inductions. The general had been crowding the local boards for weeks, 'scrapping the bottom of the barrel,' and wouldn't do it." (P. 207, Senate hearings.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I regret that I cannot yield.

I continue reading from Gist:

ENLISTMENTS RETARDED BY RAISING ARMY ENTRANCE TESTS SAYS REVERCOMB

Senator REVERCOMB. A month ago the Army raised the passing grade in the Army general classification test from 59 to 70 * * * its effect has been that the number of volunteers accepted has dropped * * *. If competent to serve in time of actual war, certainly they are competent for a peacetime army. This action has a very direct bearing on the question of the extension of the draft, because if it can be shown that a volunteer army can be raised * * * there is no need to extend the draft. (P. 3240, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 6.) (Next page: General Paul says Army "eliminating professional private.")

What did General Eisenhower say? I challenge any Senator to dispute it. I continue to read from Gist:

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, testifying before Senate Military Affairs Committee, April 8:

"There is no one that I know of, either in or out of the Army, that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers could he get all the volunteers."

We maintain, Mr. President, that if the soldiers' pay is raised, if the caste system is taken out of the Army, if the

men are given the same terminal leave as officers, we will have all the volunteers we need in this country. I well remember the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] agreeing with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. They believed that if those things were done, there would be very little difficulty in getting all the additional volunteers that we need.

Gist continues with the statement of General Eisenhower:

I can't tell any more than anyone else what this unknown factor of the 20 percent (proposed base pay increase) will make on our recruiting. I believe in it.

The 18-year-old man is not so suitable as an older man for a number of duties in the Army (including garrison duty).

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON of Colorado. We are a great Nation with 140,000,000 people strong and yet in order to get an army of 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947, we have to resort to conscripting school boys.

General EISENHOWER. If there is some other way of raising this army—giving us an army of 3-year volunteers, sir, to do these jobs, you may be sure I will welcome it.

Senator JOHNSON. I want to thank you, General, for making that point clear. Some of the folks in the War Department seem to think it is their job to give us the details and lay down rules and formulas and go into the whole mass of ways and means of securing the army. The War Department's responsibility ends when they tell us their minimum needs and ours begins. It is our duty, it is our responsibility to the homes of America, to the 18-year-old youths of America, to the college and school boys of America, to see that we do not adopt a harsh method, a more harsh method than necessary.

Mr. President, never in the history of the Senate has there been a statesman who has spoken truer words.

I continue to read from Gist:

General EISENHOWER. If you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds, I am for it.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming. The thing to do is to improve the inducement for the voluntary enlistments and forget about taking the 18-year-old boys, first because they don't constitute very much and secondly because they are not good garrison soldiers.

Mr. President, nearly 4 years ago upon this very floor I advocated exactly what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked for. The United States Senate would not grant it. It said that \$50 a month was enough for a GI. The only other Senator who advocated it on the floor was the distinguished former Senator from the State of Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, the first national commander of the American Legion.

I continue to read from Gist:

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia. Until a short time ago the passing mark was 59 (Army general classification test). It was raised about a month ago to 70. It was raised while we were in this program of taking in volunteers.

According to Gist, Maj. Gen. W. S. Paul, who was in charge of Army recruiting, said:

We were getting more of the low-grade men than we can use in the Army. Our small Army must be a highly capable Army. We are eliminating the professional private.

Then the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the very man who now is advocating that the Senate concur in the House amendment, said:

Comparative statistics are no good if you change any of the rules in regard to the statistics.

Statistics are kept for exact information so that we can read into the future, if possible. If, for example, the number is changed something like 10 percent, then it is improper to come and say there is a falling off in voluntary enlistments for March. We know that 10 percent falling off has come about as a result of your own action.

Those are the words of the distinguished Senator from Utah. I repeat, Mr. President, that 4 years ago, upon this very floor, time and time and time again, opportunity was given to the Senate to take steps to enable the GI's, the men who compose the fighting forces of America, to obtain some of the things which now are suddenly being offered to them in the hope of stimulating voluntary enlistments. Let me make the situation clear. Fifty dollars a month was paid to a boy who was down in the fox holes, to a boy who was risking his life, to a boy who did not know from one hour to the next—not even from one minute to the next—whether he was going to live, whether he was going to have the use of his arms or his limbs. But now, in peacetime, those who are in the Army are told, "We are going to give you more"—which is absolute proof of the correctness of the statement made on this floor by former Senator Bennett Clark, of Missouri, who said that \$50 a month was not enough for the GI's to be paid. It is proof that Senator Clark, the former distinguished commander of the American Legion, knew just what the GI's were going to be up against.

Mr. President, at the committee hearings to which I have been referring, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] said that a pay raise "certainly will induce greater volunteering."

In reply, General Eisenhower said:

I don't see how it could help but do so.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives has already passed the joint resolution including the amendments, and now the Senate is asked to agree to the motion to concur in the House amendments. But if hereafter voluntary enlistments increase, it will not be necessary to extend the draft.

Mr. President, I have another matter which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. Congress has been asked to extend Selective Service for another year, but the statements of those favoring draft extension reveal that, in the final analysis, the real goal is to draft the 'teen-age boys. Only General Eisenhower, of all our military leaders, has expressly stated that he would prefer to have older men than to have 18-year-old boys. He not only said that "for occupational duty in foreign lands I do not believe the 18-year-old boy is as good as the 25-year-old," but he said, "Frankly, if you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds I am for it."

Mr. President, in my judgment the most serious aspect of the whole idea of

draft extension is the drafting of young boys who should be at home and in school. There are at least five important reasons. There is a moral reason; there is a health reason; the draft will injure democracy; it will injure this Nation's educational and scientific status; it will injure this Nation in its foreign and diplomatic relations, thus endangering world peace.

The newspapers have been filled with accounts of the moral conditions in the Army—the black markets, the looting, the prostitution, and the riotous conduct even toward former allies. In order to meet this situation General McNarney instituted a program for combating "deterioration of discipline and morale among American troops in Europe." I quote from an Associated Press dispatch of April 25:

Admitting that both discipline and morale had declined seriously within the last few months, the European commander told a news conference he had issued orders that "prompt and corrective measures must be taken to remove the cause, deal swiftly and justly with the offenders, and prevent any future occurrences."

McNarney had cited as examples of weakened Army discipline black market sales, drunkenness, high automobile accident rate, general lack of smartness in appearance and military courtesy, and an excessive venereal disease rate.

Mr. President, that is what was said by the general who was in charge over there, the man who knows the situation, the man who has been there and is there now. That is his analysis of this entire matter.

Mr. President, I do not speak for any other Senator upon this floor, but I feel that in the keeping of the Senate of the United States is the well-being, the happiness, and the health of all those who are the children of our neighbors and who are over there in the forces of occupation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry I cannot yield at this time. I said when I began that I wished to conclude. I shall finish in a little while, if I possibly can do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator be through in a short time?

Mr. LANGER. I hope to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator be through by 6 o'clock?

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps not; perhaps it will be 7 o'clock or later.

Mr. TOBEY. I have asked these questions because I wish to make some plans; that is all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when there is talk of drill-field exercises to combat promiscuity, venereal disease, and black-market activity, it is obvious that the root of the problem is being untouched. A New York Times correspondent, Raoumond Daniell, understood this very well when he wrote for the New York Times of April 28 that:

The restoration of discipline in the United States Army of Occupation in Germany, as ordered by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, European theater commander, will not be an easy task. Money, women, and liquor, in just about that order, are the chief preoccupation of too many soldiers for the situation to be cured by the imposition of a curfew

regulation, close-order drill, and other similar measures, it is believed.

Redeployment and agitation for ending the so-called caste system have contributed to the deterioration of the morale, but the trouble lies deeper than that. Basically, it springs from the lack of effective political indoctrination and a general feeling of utter futility among the soldiers, who too often have no conception of why they are here.

Mr. President, first we have the words of the general in charge of the occupation forces abroad, and, secondly, the words of the correspondent of the New York Times. I assert that it is important for every Senator to have in his mind a picture of the real situation into which boys are being placed before Senators vote in favor of the extension of the draft. We must keep in mind that these boys have been drafted out of homes and out of schools. Many of them have never before been away from home.

Mr. President, nearly 10 days ago, both the Senate and the House of Representatives passed a bill concerning this matter and sent it to the President for his signature. Up until last night he had not signed it. If he has signed it since, I have not been so informed. The bill provided that persons in North Dakota, New Mexico, Kentucky, or any other State, who wished to send food to relatives in Germany would be permitted to do so.

The Congress also passed another bill, one relating to the postal situation, which has been lying for a long time on the President's desk for his signature. It has not been signed.

I represent many constituents who have relatives in Germany. They wished to know why they were not allowed to send to their relatives in Germany a little food so as to keep body and soul together, especially when the calories allowed to each person in that country have been reduced to 1,000 a day.

A few days ago there was some criticism of my remarks with regard to the British loan. I had talked in opposition to the loan, but certainly not so long as one other Senator who had spoken in its favor. It was so easy to say that some of us who were opposed to the loan had talked hours, hours, and hours, when, as a matter of fact, that was not true at all. I agreed to have the joint resolution providing for the extension of the draft come before the Senate. It was passed and sent to the other House. When it got there the Members of the House took, to some extent, an adverse view of the matter, having read, no doubt, newspapers and periodicals like the *Christian Century*, which portrays the deplorable conditions affecting our Army in Germany, or, perhaps, the Members of the House had been reading mail from home. Perhaps they had been receiving telegrams from persons who opposed the extension of the draft.

I have been told that the Chief of Army Chaplains, Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller, in testifying on peacetime conscription before a House committee, said that he believed Army training and service would stimulate the religious life of the men of our Nation. I quote from his statement as reported in the July 2, 1945, issue

of *Newsweek*. This is what Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller said:

As a parent and as a clergyman, I would oppose military training with all my heart if I thought it would destroy morals.

When a young corporal, Erwing W. Wadsworth, of Gulfport, Miss., saw this statement, he wrote a letter to *Newsweek* which appeared in their July 30 issue. He said:

I wish to express complete disagreement with the contention of Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller, chief of Army chaplains, "that, due to the religious program of our armed forces, more young men have attended church, read the Bible, and earnestly prayed than at any other time in the history of our country." Just the reverse is the case.

Owing to the separation from his home, parents, wife, sweetheart, and friends, the average serviceman drinks more, swears harder, attends church less, and is more promiscuous than at any time previous to entering the armed forces. There is nothing whatever in the training program of impressionable youths in the service which would make them read the Bible, attend church, or earnestly engage in prayer. They are taught to hate and kill the enemy. There is no consolation to be found in religion to help them accomplish the things for which they are trained.

I might add, Mr. President, that that is not exactly true. Some months ago I had the great privilege of attending, with a great many other Senators, at Hotel 2400, a meeting presided over by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], one of the finest meetings of the Gideons I have ever attended. We have that organization in North Dakota, and they have done a remarkable job for the home life of this country.

I have here a pamphlet gotten out by Governor Philip La Follette, three times governor of the State of Wisconsin, one of the outstanding men in this country, who takes a position against peacetime conscription. I desire to read merely a part of what this distinguished statesman says. Philip La Follette, a veteran of World War I and a veteran of World War II, three times governor of the State of Wisconsin, says:

I take my position against peacetime conscription as an individual, as an American citizen who has served in the Army in both world wars, briefly as a youth in World War I, more extensively as an adult in World War II.

I am convinced that the conscription issue is one whose determination is bound to have an enduring impact on the peace of the world, the security of America, and the survival of our cherished democracy. I should like to make two points clear at the outset. In the first place, my argument, as will soon become clear, is directed against all versions of peacetime conscription, the new proposal by the American Legion no less than the original scheme of the War Department and President Truman.

In the second place, I do not propose to deal in this article with what I regard as a synthetic, or artificial type of argument in behalf of peacetime conscription—the arguments, for instance, that universal military service will develop the health of our youth, indoctrinate our young men with a moral discipline, provide them with job training, strengthen their characters, or provide a substitute for full employment. Arguments of this kind, it seems to me, have been ade-

quately dealt with by the educators, clergymen, Senators, and others who have already written on this subject for the *Progressive*.

Governor La Follette said further—and certainly his words are entitled to much credit, for he served in two wars:

I approach the subject here exclusively as an issue of national defense—the defense of America from external aggression and the defense of our democracy from the internal assaults of those who are captivated by the short cut methods of alien ideologies and the total militarism of foreign totalitarianism.

The invasion of an American's liberty by universal military service is justified only when it is unmistakably clear that the Nation's security demands it. Our national security does not now demand it. On the contrary, universal military service is now almost completely out of date and its adoption would almost certainly lull us into a false sense of security, just as the Maginot Line tricked the French into a complacency which proved their undoing 6 years ago.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Not now; a little later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator can give me any information as to how much later.

Mr. LANGER. Sometime later, not so long.

Mr. President, one House amendment we are considering provides:

(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.

The second House amendment reads:

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

Mr. President, the joint resolution as passed by the Senate provided as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946."

So, Mr. President, we come back to the proposition enunciated a short time ago. Governor La Follette further said:

Most of us can agree that in time of war conscription is the fairest and most equitable way of sharing the risks and hardships of combat. In time of peace, however, the duties of the average soldier are comparable to those of any metropolitan policeman. There is no more reason to apply coercion to the recruitment of GI's than to policemen.

America needs a peacetime army, both for overseas duty and to provide a powerful,

swift, mobile, highly trained, perfectly equipped force to defend us against any threat of aggression.

But we are talking here not of sheer numbers, or of size for the sake of size, but rather of a compact, highly specialized force of experts. We are talking here of a force of keen technicians thoroughly trained to master and keep abreast with the highly complicated instruments of modern warfare, rather than millions of conscripts rushed through a "quickie" course of calisthenics, close and extended order drill, and the other routines of a 1-year course under conscription.

Modern science is repealing many of the old laws of war which served so usefully in the past. The classical military injunctions have become obsolete in the age in which a single atomic bomb can pulverize an entire battlefield. Some of those old military concepts become perilous folly in an age in which a rocket plane streaking through the sky with the speed of sound can blast to bits a transport vessel ploughing through the seas with 10,000 conscript foot-soldiers.

Anyone who has looked with any imagination into the Pandora's box that military science has opened in recent years knows that the technical complexity of warfare will increase rather than diminish.

Governor La Follette offers a program of four points which he says is better than universal military conscription, and in the short time I have remaining, Mr. President, I wish to place the four points in the RECORD:

1. Establish a minimum pay scale starting at \$100 a month, plus the usual allowances, for privates, with a corresponding increase in scale for noncommissioned officers.

2. Provide a system of promotions from the ranks and a program of education and in-service training to enable GI's to qualify for advancement and to become trained technicians.

3. Strike at the military caste system by narrowing the difference in clothes, quarters, mess, legal rights, and social life between GI's and officers.

4. Improve the officer class by putting appointments to West Point (and Annapolis) on a civil-service basis, and by putting peacetime promotions on a basis of competitive examinations.

So, Mr. President, although I have taken some 2½ or 3 hours, I feel that I have truly represented my constituents, as requested in the thousands of letters I have received. I have presented, I believe, in the 2½ hours the feelings of those who are opposed to universal military conscription at this particular time. I have presented it in my humble and feeble way, but as best I could.

I want to say to those who have asked me to yield, especially to the distinguished majority leader, who so many times has been very kind to me, that I thought I could save time and expedite the matter by presenting it as promptly and as rapidly as possible. I am very sorry if I have taken more time than perhaps some Senators thought I should have taken, but I did so on my conscience and as a matter of duty, feeling that in the hands of the Senate today rests the moral welfare of thousands and thousands of our neighbors' boys in all States, New York, Maine, Illinois, and Ohio and all other States and to the thousands who have written to me and protested against the extension of the draft I say that I have presented the

matter in the best way of which I am capable.

Mr. President, I agree fully and entirely with what the House has done. The overwhelming vote in the House yesterday shows the influence of public opinion, as it has been expressed by religious organizations, by educational institutions, by businessmen, by farmers and laboring men all over America. If the measure is passed, I only hope that in passing it the Senate will make no mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 159. All those in favor will say "Aye."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those opposed will say "No." The "ayes" have it, and the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked for recognition before the Chair announced that the amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator did not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was on my feet, and wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry before the Presiding Officer ever used the gavel and announced that the amendments had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a matter of judgment, the Chair will say to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has asked unanimous consent to consider the increased-pay bill, that I had agreed with some Members on this side that before the House amendments were concurred in I would either call for a quorum or summon them to the floor, because one of them wished to offer an amendment to the joint resolution.

I wish the RECORD to show that I was on my feet seeking recognition in order to protect other Senators, because they were not present, and that I did so in good faith. I also wish to reiterate that I feel that the present occupant of the chair [Mr. O'MAHONEY] announced the concurrence of the Senate in the House amendments at the time I was seeking recognition. Although I was on my feet, I was not recognized, and I feel that the rights of Senators who wished to be protected were foreclosed because of the action of the present occupant of the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia;

S. 1955. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing

furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator; and

S. 1980. An act to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

PROHIBITION OF PROSTITUTION IN THE VICINITY OF MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one more matter respecting which I ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me so that I can ask for Senate action. Tonight the act which prohibits prostitution in the military camps of the country will expire. The House has passed a bill dealing with the matter, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider it and pass it, so that the law may not come to an end tonight.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6305) to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments, and I submit a report (No. 1332) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, with all the noise in the Chamber I could not quite hear what the proposed legislation would cover. Also, I should like to inquire whether the request is merely for the temporary laying aside of the unfinished business?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It merely means the laying aside temporarily of the unfinished business.

In answer to the first question, Mr. President, I will say that there is on the statute books a law which allows the Army and the Navy to prohibit prostitution within the borders and within close proximity of Army camps everywhere. That law comes to an end tonight unless Congress reenacts it. The House has already acted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the calendar number?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill is House bill 6305, but it has not a calendar number, because it was unanimously reported from the Committee on Military Affairs only today. I am sure the Senator from California would not want to see this law expire at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should still like to know what the law is. I object to taking up a bill which is not on the calendar, unless we know in detail what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Utah will send the bill to the desk the clerk will read it by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, H. R. 6305, to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. We cannot hear back here, and I should like to have an explanation of what this bill is and what it purports to do.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, several years ago, when the Army camps were organized, the Congress of the United States passed a law prohibiting prostitution in areas which are close to the Army camps. That law has been in force for several years. It is a law which had a termination period. That termination period is tonight, at the same time as the Selective Service Act. This bill would make the law permanent, and continue the act as it has been administered for the last several years. It would do great hurt to our country, especially in the military districts, and would cause great confusion if we were to allow to elapse the law dealing with this great peril at this time. I am sure every Senator will agree that the action taken by the House was a proper one. The House passed the bill on May 10, but we received the bill only this morning and reported it favorably, so it is necessary for me now to ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my difficulty is this: It is now proposed to make permanent a law of which I have no copy and of which no Senator has a copy. It was a temporary law; now it is proposed to make it permanent, instead of merely extending it, as we have done with respect to other temporary laws. It is proposed to make a temporary law permanent, and I have no copy of the bill. I certainly object to taking up the bill on any such basis.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not like to persist in a point, but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has withdrawn his objection to the consideration of House bill 6305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah renew his request for unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah for the present consideration of House bill 6305?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6305) to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], during the recess of the Senate may sign enrolled bills ready for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID FOR VETERANS' EDUCATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have today released a statement with reference to the Federal housing problem, particularly as it affects colleges. In that connection I will say that I have introduced two bills, Senate bill 1770 and Senate bill 2085, dealing with veterans' aid, which are now before the Committee on Education and Labor. The hour is late and Senators are desirous of going to their homes. So, Mr. President, I shall wait until tomorrow to make my statement on the necessity for the enactment into law of these two bills. The statement which I released today with reference to the Federal aid for veterans' education will be made in the Senate tomorrow.

INCREASE OF BASE PAY OF ENLISTED MEN

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the majority leader and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. There is pending on the calendar the bill S. 2038, to increase the rates of monthly base pay of enlisted men of the lower five pay grades of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for the purpose of encouraging voluntary enlistments in the armed forces. I believe that there is no controversy with respect to this measure, and that it will not be opposed by any Senator, though, of course, sometimes we cannot tell about such matters. The bill has been thoroughly discussed heretofore. It is a bill that may well accompany the extension of the Selective Service Act to July 1, because it encourages enlistments by raising the pay of men in the services in the lower five grades.

I will say, Mr. President, that the amounts fixed in the bill are the same as those fixed in another bill which was reported favorably by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Senate bill 2038 was introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and myself. We placed in it the amounts for each grade which were agreed upon by the Military Affairs Committee when the other bill was reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, in order that the Senate take up for consideration Senate bill 2038.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from West Virginia state the calendar number?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is calendar No. 1189.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say it is

true that the bill alluded to by the Senator from West Virginia is a pay bill, a bill seeking to raise the Army pay of the first five grades of enlisted men, and it is true that the rates of pay are the same as carried in the more comprehensive bill, which encompasses all the features of renewing the selective-service law. But the Senator's bill is by itself merely a pay act, while the larger bill, renewing all the provisions of the present existing Selective Service Act, takes into consideration everything else it is so necessary to consider now in reinstating selective service. Therefore I hope the Senate will not consider merely a pay-increase bill at this time, but will look at the larger problem, the necessity, for instance, of discharging veterans, the necessity of fixing a maximum length of service to be required of each inductee, and many other matters which will come up when we consider the more comprehensive measure.

I also wish to say that the bill is not in line with the pay increases recommended by the House of Representatives. The House bill passed some few weeks ago recommended an increase of 10 percent in the pay of officers in the higher ranks, 20 percent for lieutenants, and some different amounts for enlisted men in the several grades. I believe we should reconcile the two bills; that is provide equal rates of pay in the Senate bill and in the House bill. Certainly I would not like to see Senate bill 2038 taken up by unanimous consent at this time, at least without a quorum call. I should want more members of the Committee on Military Affairs present, to ascertain whether in their judgment it should be taken up at this time. So I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not press his request tonight. I should not like to object, but I should rather have more members of the Military Affairs Committee present when he makes his request.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from South Dakota that this bill is a counterpart of the very bill reported by the Senator from South Dakota. The rates of pay are identical with those contained in the general bill for extension of the draft. We know that the Senate has extended the draft, not through the bill originally reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, but by means of stop-gap legislation. I want the effect of the pay increase at once, so that the pay of the enlisted men may be raised, and so that we may have the benefit of the inducement of increased pay for further enlistments for the 6 weeks until July 1.

The sole purpose is to increase voluntary enlistments. If the Army really wants voluntary enlistments, and if we in the Senate are going to support the idea of voluntary enlistments, I see no reason to postpone the pay raise which is included in a separate bill.

With respect to the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives, of course that is a different bill, and it will have to go to conference. But long before we could act upon the bill originally reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, and referred to by the able

Senator from South Dakota, we should put into effect the pay raise, so that the inducement for the enlistments will exist from this time on, or just as quickly as we can put it into effect. So I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from West Virginia, but I apprehend that when we assembled today we had no purpose, after the long afternoon session, to call the calendar, and I feel that we ought not to attempt to do so piecemeal tonight. I shall not object to the pending request, but I shall object to any further requests for consideration of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the Senator from Maine is objecting to this particular request?

Mr. WHITE. No. I am merely giving notice that I shall object to further requests.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator from Maine and other Senators that I would not make this request except that there has been an extension of the draft. We have talked of voluntary enlistments. This is one of the inducements to voluntary enlistments. It is complementary to the act extending the draft, and that is the reason why I think special consideration should be given to the bill at this time.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the measure which the Senator from West Virginia seeks to bring up at this late hour is very important. It is of vast scope. As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has said, it is allied with many other subjects. I believe that the hour is too late, and that there are not enough Senators present to consider it as this time, and I regret that I am obliged to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN MATTERS RELATING TO SOCIAL PROTECTION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know that Senators probably look with disfavor upon the idea of requesting consideration of a bill on the calendar at this time; but the bill which the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] had passed a little while ago has to do with protecting military camps against the evils of prostitution.

There is on the calendar a bill which has the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, after hearings. The authors of the bill are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself. The bill would make \$700,000 a year available through the Federal Security Administrator for continued cooperation with the various States and political subdivisions in the fight against the vice of prostitution.

The bill is so pertinent to the bill which has just been passed that I shall ask

unanimous consent for its present consideration. It involves a very small amount of money. The bill is recommended by the military authorities and by the Surgeon General. Hearings have been held, and the committee unanimously reported the bill. I wonder if the Senate would grant unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

With that explanation, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1779.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

David L. Bazelon, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Norman M. Littell; and

Victor E. Anderson, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH KORMANN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia Branch, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia Branch, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 15, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

Henry W. Hemple to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of April 1946.

Edwin A. Dorner to be aide with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of April 1946.

Robert C. Darling to be aide with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 16th day of April 1946.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia Branch, Selective Service System, with compensation at the rate of \$6,230 per annum.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, for the sake of Him who has worn the robe of mortal flesh that we might be saved, hear our prayer. We pray for the humble heart wherein may be enshrined the spirit of our Master, in which there is no guile or presumption. In the crises of sin, of sorrow, and disappointment, when life suddenly leaps into fierce emergency and the shadows are deep, Thy unsearchable riches are ever available. O let us feel the clear realm of patience and the supremacy of a sustaining faith in Thy Fatherhood, in which we can be more than conquerors.

Thou who art wisdom incarnate and love divine, may our souls be beyond the clutch of adversity or the defeat of fear; taught by the experience of the years and directed by the blessedness of Thy companionship, lead us on to the heights of sacred duty and aspiration. In the name of Him who was wounded for our transgressions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the